

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI

November 1918

NUMBER 7

PELLES, PELLINOR, AND PELLEAN IN THE OLD FRENCH ARTHURIAN ROMANCES

II. *Pellinor*.

I will say at once that, in my opinion, Pellinor is the invention of the author of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation. Except as a variant in two MSS for the passage of the *Queste*, VI, 150, the name occurs only in the *Merlin* continuations of the Vulgate cycle, MS 337 and the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle (i.e., Huth *Merlin*, Spanish *Demanda*) and in the prose *Tristan*. Now, of these works the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation is unquestionably the earliest,¹ and it seems most natural to assume that the character was adopted from this branch by the rest. Indeed, only in the case of the *Merlin* of the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle is the question debatable, and we shall return to that in a moment.

¹ Cf. E. Brugger, *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXVIII (1905), 57 f., for relations of the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337 to that of the Vulgate cycle. *Ibid.*, XXIX (1905), 109, he expresses the opinion that the Huth *Merlin* is entirely independent of the Vulgate. So, too, G. Paris, p. lxiiv of the Introduction to the Huth *Merlin* (Paris, 1886). But the pseudo-Robert cycle (to which the Huth *Merlin* belongs) with its *Tristan* contaminations, is certainly later than the Vulgate cycle. Observe, too, what I have said above, p. 113, note, on the lateness of this cycle as compared with the Vulgate. In his well-known treatise, *Über die verschiedenen Redaktionen des Robert von Borron zugeschriebenen Graal-Lancelot-Cyklus* (Halle, 1895), E. Wechsler assumes throughout that the Vulgate and the so-called Robert de Borron cycle are both derived from a common source—i.e., an antecedent cycle that has been lost—but he gives no proof of this assumption. He recognizes, however, explicitly (pp. 5, 18, *et passim*) that the prose *Tristan* influenced the second of the above-named cycles—hence was anterior to it. Later redactions of the *Tristan*, he thinks, were in turn influenced by the pseudo-Robert cycle.

The name first occurs in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, II, 125, where Brangoire, addressing the rebel kings about the Saxon invasion, says:

ne par decha du roy peiles de listenois natendons nous nul secors car il garde le roy pelinoir son frere qui gist malades dun mal dont iamaiz naura garison tant que cil vendra laiens qui les auentures du saint graal metera a fin. ne del roy alain qui gist malades natendons nous nul secors deuant ce que li mieudres cheualiers del monde uiegne a lui & li demant dont cele maladie li vint & quel chose li graus est que len sert.

And again we read (*ibid.*, II, 159) that Guinevere is the wisest, loveliest, and best-loved woman of "la bloie bretaine," except "elaine sans per le feme persides le rous" and the daughter of Pelles. The text, however, which Sommer is following in his edition of the Vulgate cycle, is corrupt in this place, and we shall have to reproduce the reading of MS 747 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, as given by him in *Modern Philology*, V, 305. Here, too, it is said that only two women of her time were comparable to Guinevere, viz., "Helainne sans per qui fu feme persides le rous," and

la fille le roi pelles de listenois del chastel de corbenye, qui fu niece le riche roi pescheor & le roi malade de plaies dont li uns ert apelez alains des illes an listenois. & cil ert malades de maladies de plaies & li riches rois qui estoit apelez mehaigniez estoit naurez parmi les .ii. cuisses de la lance uengeresse & fu apelez par son droit non quant il estoit en sante li rois pellinor de listenois. & li rois alains & li rois pelinor si furent frere germain & cele pucele dont ie uos di si estoit lor niece & fille le roi pelles qui frere (estoit) a ces .ii. dont ie uos ai dit. icele pucelle fu la plus bele que len ueist onques an la terre & la plus nete. icele garda le santisme graal iusquitel ior que galaad fu engendrez.

We find Pellinor still further in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation as the name of a brother of Pelles in the following passages, II, 359 (Pellinor de la saluage forest souveraine), where he is said to have had eleven sons of at least seventeen years of age, also a twelfth, who had not come to court, and the mother was now pregnant with the thirteenth, page 374 (Pellinor de Listenois), page 384 (Pellinor de la terre gaste). He is doubtless alluded to, though not named, in the following passages: II, 221, where a knight is described as kinsman

"al roy pelles de listenois & a ses freres," and II, 346, where he is described as Eliezer's uncle, wounded in the thighs.

What led the author of this *Merlin* continuation of the Vulgate cycle to invent the new brother of Pelles? In seeking an answer to this question one should remember that this branch is, as is generally agreed, the last part of the Vulgate cycle to be composed. The author, accordingly, had before him the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, in which (I, 252) Alain is called the *roi pescheor*, and, on the other hand, the prose *Lancelot* and *Queste*, in which Pelles was the *roi pescheor*. Furthermore, he had in his texts the *roi mahaigrie*, who was, generally speaking, not given a specific name in any of the branches of the cycle before the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation itself. The only exceptions in this vast extent of material are the following:

1. *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290, where in Sommer's text he is called Pelleam, although in the manuscript followed by Hucher, *Le Saint Graal*, III, 295, he is son of Pelleam and unnamed. I shall return to this exception in the discussion of Pelleam's (Pelleam's) name.

2. Prose *Lancelot*, III, 29, where he is called Pelles. But this passage, with its *Queste* references, certainly did not belong to the *Lancelot* in its original form. It is an obvious interpolation and contains another gross blunder besides this identification of Pelles with the Maimed King, viz., in making Amide or Helizabel both Galahad's mother and his sister.

3. *Queste*, VI, 150. I have discussed this passage above.

The author of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, therefore, found in his texts two *rois pescheors*, Alain and Pelles, and an unnamed *roi mahaigrie*. Pelles, however, was far more important in the Vulgate cycle than Alain, so that our author keeps Pelles as *roi pescheor*, and, despite his mystic title, as a king of the ordinary kind who guards the castle and the people in it. It was natural that he should do this, for this was, on the whole, Pelles' character in the prose *Lancelot*, and even in the *Queste*. On the other hand, he follows the general tendency of the later Arthurian romances to give a definite name to hitherto unnamed characters. Among innumerable examples of this tendency compare Galahad's mother, who, despite Sommer's side notes and the index to his edition of the Vulgate

cycle, is unnamed in that cycle, but is called Elaine in Malory.¹ So, too, the Maid of Ascalot first receives the specific name, Elaine, in Malory. In compliance with this tendency the Maimed King is given the name Pellinor, which is formed on the name of Pelles.²

Now, although our author takes Pelles as the Fisher King, he keeps Alain as a second Maimed King—doubtless, under the influence of Chrétien, in whose *Perceval*, as we have seen, there were really two Maimed Kings. Besides, the author of this *Merlin* continuation would be little disposed to drop any member of the Grail family, for it was his policy to crowd into his pages every Arthurian character of any prominence, as is evident from the enormous number of names which this branch of the cycle contains. And in addition to these considerations, he would have the powerful motive of establishing a trinity of Grail Kings to parallel that of the Christian Godhead. When Pellinor is provided with such an abundance of sons, this is in imitation of Bron, the first Fisher King in de Borron's *Joseph*³ and in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*.⁴

Finally, the author harmonizes the reconstituted Grail family by making Pelles, Pellinor, and Alain, brothers.⁵

¹ Brugger, *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XL², 46, n. 10, offers an erroneous explanation of how the daughter of Pelles came to be called Helaine (Elaine). The true explanation is simple. In the passage of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, which compares Guinevere with Pelles' daughter and Helaine sans per and which I have just quoted according to the reading of MS 747, a scribe dropped out by mistake the *et* (or its symbol) which connected the names of the two heroines. In consequence of this error, we find the two already confounded in the Middle English version of the Vulgate *Merlin*. Cf. H. B. Wheatley's edition for the Early English Text Society (1865), Part I, p. 229.

² Brugger, *op. cit.*, p. 48, n. 11, has already suggested that the name Pellinor was arbitrarily fabricated in dependence on the name Pelles. Was the name of Virgil's pilot, Palinurus, in the author's mind? In such cases the mediaeval romancers regarded a general resemblance as sufficient. Cf. my discussion of the name, "Galahad," in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXIII (1918), 129 ff.

³ Cf. G. Weidner's edition (Oppeln, 1881), p. 123. Bron had twelve sons.

⁴ Sommer's *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, I, 249. It was, no doubt, the example of Bron in the *Joseph*, that led the author of the *Perlesvaus* to make his Grail Knight, Perceval, one of twelve sons. It is true that he makes Bron's son, Alain (II Gros), father of the twelve sons, but in such shiftings the writers of Arthurian romance exercise complete freedom.

⁵ Alain occurs only once as Pelles' brother in the Vulgate cycle outside of the *Merlin* continuation, viz., in the *Lancelot*, III, 117. But the passage, since it contains allusions to the *Queste* and *Estoire*, could not have belonged originally to the *Lancelot*. It is an interpolation—taken, indeed, from the passage of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, II, 159, which I have quoted above from MS 747. To be sure, Sommer, *Modern Philology*, V, 305, and Brugger, *op. cit.*, p. 49, n. 11, are inclined to believe that the reverse is true. Sommer has, still further, injudiciously adopted in the *Queste*, VI, 102, the reading *Alain* instead of the true reading *Herlan* (son of Pierre, Alain's brother), which latter is found in

Pellinor, who was thus invented, as I maintain, by the author of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, is found also in the *Merlin* continuation of the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle, which is best represented by the Huth MS. There he is Perceval's father.¹ It is not likely, however, that the author of this new *Merlin* continuation derived the character directly from the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation. G. Paris has asserted² that the Huth *Merlin* is entirely independent of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation and that the authors of these continuations executed them "sans se connaître."³ Perhaps, however, this last phrase is too strong. The author of the Huth *Merlin* may have ignored his predecessor's work, first, because the two authors, as Paris himself observes, pursued different aims, the author of the Vulgate version fashioning in his work an introduction to the *Lancelot*, the author of the Huth *Merlin* endeavoring to connect the *Merlin* of de Borron with the *Queste*. Second, because of the difference in the tendencies of the authors, which is about as great as could well be imagined. The Vulgate version is, for the most part, a pseudo-historical record of endless wars, in the style of the chronicles; the Huth *Merlin*, as befitted a work which belongs to the later development of Arthurian romance, is composed of romantic fictions of the most extravagant kind. The author of the latter was certainly familiar with all the other members of the Vulgate cycle—so how can we suppose him ignorant of the branch in which he would naturally be most interested, especially when that branch was one of the most widely diffused works of the Middle Ages? At any rate, Brugger's contention⁴ that, if the one author had known of the other's work, he would probably not have composed a new continuation is not

MSS M and R, and (with corrupt spellings) in still others that he cites. Nowhere else in the Arthurian romances is Alain given a son, *Argustes*, whereas we have in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 280, *Agristes* named as a descendant of Herlan.

¹ The passages bearing on this subject are I, 150, 160, 258, 260 f. We have here the same trick as in the description of Pelles in the *Lancelot* and *Queste*: one has to assemble these passages to make out clearly that Pellinor is Perceval's father. In the Spanish version of the *Merlin* continuation of this cycle Pellinor is also found. Cf. Bonilla's edition of the *Demanda*, pp. 124, 126, 137-44. He does not appear in the *Demanda* proper (i.e., the *Quest* section).

² Introduction to the Huth *Merlin*, p. lxiv.

³ So, too, Wechsler's above-quoted treatise, p. 5, and Brugger, *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXIX, 109.

⁴ See passage cited in preceding note. I hope to show in a future article that the influence of the Vulgate *Merlin* is, after all, discernible in the Huth *Merlin*.

sustained by what we know of the methods of the Arthurian romancers; for, as a matter of fact, a new Mort Arthur section was composed for the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle, although the writer knew the Vulgate version well and used it largely, and, what is perhaps even more to the point, the author of the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337 composed his own work, though he was familiar with the corresponding Vulgate version, as Brugger himself has observed.¹ It seems to me most probable that the author of the Huth *Merlin* was incited to write his branch of the new cycle by the Vulgate version, the author of which also ascribed his work to Robert de Borron, but for the reasons recited, gave his narrative an altogether different turn.

To come back, however, to the question of Pellinor in the Huth *Merlin*, the character was derived, no doubt, by the author of that romance from the prose *Tristan*. The influence of the latter romance, as Wechssler (p. 5) has set forth, is the distinguishing mark of this cycle, as compared with the Vulgate, and we have, I believe, in the matter now before us, one of the manifestations of this influence. In the prose *Tristan*, too, Pellinor was Perceval's father, and it was no doubt the author of this romance who originally conferred on him that honor.² The author of the *Tristan* took this particular name from the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation and gave it to Perceval's father, most likely because Pellinor was there connected with the Grail as a Grail King, just as Perceval was the Grail Knight in other romances. The Grail attributes of Pellinor, however, if we may judge by Löseth's analysis, are effaced in the brief passages concerning him in the *Tristan*, which mainly relate to his death, and this, no doubt, is the reason why the same thing is true of the character in the Huth *Merlin*. The connection of the main passage in the prose *Tristan* about Pellinor (Löseth, p. 234) with the Huth *Merlin*, I, 261, is too obvious for dispute. In both we have Gawain figuring as the slayer of Pellinor (who had slain Gawain's father) and the enemy of his sons. Under these circumstances, to explain Pellinor's

¹ *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXVIII (1905), 57.

² The writers of the Arthurian romances were not bound by tradition in naming the fathers of their heroes. In the extant romances six different names (not reckoning scribal variants) are given to Perceval's father. See Miss J. L. Weston's *Legend of Sir Perceval* (London, 1906), I, 60 ff.

part in the Huth *Merlin*, there is no need of resorting to the theory of lost cycles.

Pellinor appears again in the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337. Indeed, the peculiarity of this work is that it contains not merely one Pellinor but two. The one is the original Pellinor (as we may call him) of the Vulgate, the brother of Pelles; but there is an additional Pellinor, *not* a brother of Pelles, who, it is true, assumes the attributes of the original Pellinor, including his multitude of sons. Sommer has erroneously asserted¹ that it is the first and original Pellinor, the brother of Pelles and Alain, whom the author of this *Merlin* continuation makes the father of Perceval. But it is the second Pellinor, the *cousin* of Pelles and Alain, who is here Perceval's father. This is perfectly clear from the passages that relate to this subject in the text. Perceval's father in these passages is both *roi pescheor* and *roi mahaigrie*. The following account is given, VII, 243, of the circumstances under which he became maimed:

Il auint un soir que li rois Pellinor li peres Perceual se gisoit en son lit & pensa molt durement a merueilles que il auoit oi retraire paroles du Saint Graal & tant qui(1) les comenca a meseroire. & endementres que il saloit desesperant si uint une lance toute ardant deuers le ciel toute en flambe bruiant come foudre si le feri si durement parmi outre les cuisses ambedeus tres parmi sa robe dom il estoit couerz que tout cousi luj & son lit a la terre dure & lors li dist une uoiz au resachier hors quele fist de la lance. cest li uengemenz de ce que tu as mes oeures mescreues & moi deshonne par ta pensee fole & mauuese & por ce que tu es cil que iauoie tant essaucie de lignage sor toz autres lignages & que ge tauoie baillie en garde mon sanc & ma char & tu ten desesperoies por ce le te ferai ge si comparer que toz les iors que tu uiuras ten memberra & le ior que tu garras rendras lame du cors. tu soloies auoir non li rois de la Gaste Forest Soutaine or auras non li rois peschierres car petit auras de sante se lors non que tu seras en riuier. & le ior que Pellinor tes cosins gara tu garras & morras. & par ce que tu as mescreu mes miracles que ge demonstroie par cest pais por ce sera tes filz Perceual reusez dauoir le Graal en sa garde iusque apres la mort au fill de la fille le roi Pelles car se tes pechiez ne fust de ce que mescreu as tes filz leust auant en garde.

In consequence of his wounds, if he wished to divert himself or go anywhere, like Chrétien's *roi pescheor* (*Perceval*, pp. 3470 ff.), he resorted to a boat. In the paragraph just before this the companions of Agloval (*Perceval*'s brother) lament with him over the

¹ *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, VII, 146, n. 1; 243, n. 1.

slaying of his brothers and after expressing their compassion for his mother add:

de uostre pere ne di ge mie, fait chascuns, car toz ses deporz sunt en soi faire nagier parmi ces riuieres granz & parfondez por oblier ses plaies & sa dolor entre luj & le roi Alain son cosin & le roi Pelles du chastel de Corbenie.

Compare, too, VII, 244, where Perceval's father, hearing of the death of his fourteen sons,

ne uost onques puis estre en son recet einz sen ala seiornier u Chastel de la Merueille auec la mere au roi Artus que Merlins i auoit portee mes nu sauoient nules genz fors cil qui le Saintisme Graal auoient en garde. & aloit souent naiant en une nef enuiron le chastel par la riuere qui grant estoit (&) qui duroit iusquau chastel de Corbenie & iusquau chastel au roi Alain ilec ou il manoit. & saloient dedui(s)ant par leue de chastel en chastel por ce que mahaigie estoient par lor pechie de la lance meismes dom Ioseph d'Abaramathie fu nauurez en la hanche a la cite d' Orberique ilec ou il lascia la gent paienne a baptizier por rescorre la gent a lenemi qui les aloit ociant defors la cite.

These passages agree perfectly—in part, even in phrasing—with the description which is given of the second Pellinor, the cousin of Pelles and Alain, in this text. Cf. VII, 146, which runs as follows:

Apres ce que Gale(h)ot ot les viij. princes conquis si entra u roiaume au roi Alain le frere au roi Pellinor & le frere au roi Pelles du chastel de Corbenie qui cosin germain estoient au roi Pellinor le roi mahaigie de la cuisse de la lance ue(n)cheresse que li contes apele le riche roi pescheor por ce quil ne pooit nule foiz cheuauchier ainz le couenoit toz iors mener en nef quant il remuoit de leu en autre por le saint seruise oir que li sainz esperiz i faisoit chascun ior de la soe saintisme boche & donoit son sacrement a touz cels qui a la table seoient & asouisoit cuer dome & pensee plus que il ne seust penser tant com il fust a cele table. ne ne seoient a cele table a ce tans de lors nule foiz fors solement li rois Pellinor qui fu peres Perceual qui encores nauoit que demi an & li rois Alains qui estoit ausinc naurez de la lance desferree & Pellinor (qui) fu naurez a tout le fer. & li rois qui nule foiz ne leuoit dont li contes a molt parle u commencement Mordrains li rois de Sarraz qui ne uiuoit mais solement de loiste sacree que li angle le metoit chascun ior en la bouche & ne uiuoit dautre chose.¹

The distinction between the first Pellinor and the second is maintained, besides, in VII, 237, from which we learn, furthermore,

¹ There is a similar description of Perceval's father, but very brief, in VII, 236.

that the first Pellinor was Perceval's uncle (his mother's brother), as the second Pellinor was his father. The passage reads:

Agloual [Perceval's brother] demanda se ses peres estoit nes point asoagie & la mere dist. biaux filz coment asoagera il. ia ne se demostrent mie encore les auentures du graal par quoi il doit garison auoir. & uostre freres roi Pel(l)inor du chastel de Corbenic coment le fait il. & el(e) li dist si com ele seust.

There is accordingly no contradiction whatever in this romance, as Sommer imagines,¹ when Alain is called cousin of Perceval's father.

The explanation of the two Pellinors in this *Merlin* continuation of MS 337 is that the writer has adopted the Pellinors, respectively, of both the Vulgate *Merlin* and prose *Tristan* and given each of them a place in connection with the Grail. The Pellinor of the *Tristan*, Perceval's father and a secular figure, assumes, however, in our text as I have already remarked, the attributes of his namesake, the Grail King of the Vulgate, and himself becomes a Grail King. Like the Vulgate Pellinor, he had been wounded by the avenging lance and had a multitude of sons. On the other hand, under the influence of Chrétien's *Perceval* (ll. 6377 ff.) our author makes Perceval a nephew, through his mother, of the three Grail Kings that were taken over from the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, just as in that poem he had been, through his mother, a nephew of the mysterious Grail King, father of the *roi pescheor*. He becomes here, accordingly, a maternal nephew of the Vulgate Pellinor. The retention of the two Pellinors is due to the author's desire to sweep into his net as many Grail Kings as possible. In the above-quoted passage we see him including in the company of the Grail table even Mordrain, who had never been definitely identified with either Fisher King or Maimed King, although in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 241, and in the *Queste*, VI, 62 ff., he had suffered much the same fate as the Maimed King.²

¹ VII, 243, n. 1.

² E. Freymond, *Zeitschr. für roman. Phil.*, XVI, 106, is greatly puzzled by the Pellinors of this romance, but he does not seem to me to have brought any light into the matter. In the *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XVII, 100, n. 2, he recognizes, however, that MS 337 is here in agreement with the Huth *Merlin*, Portuguese *Demanda*, and prose *Tristan*, as to Pellinor's being the name of Perceval's father.

We face here, it is true, the difficulty that the author of the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337 does not in other points, as far as I am aware, show dependence on the prose *Tristan*. But in the *Tristan*, a work of universal fame in the Middle Ages, Pellinor is the name of Perceval's father, and, in view of this fact, there seems no need of resorting to hypothetical sources for this conception in the comparatively late text now under consideration. The author might not have any intimate acquaintance with that romance and yet derive from it, indirectly, perhaps, the conception that Perceval's father was so named.

Pellinor does not appear in either the Didot *Perceval* or the *Perlesvaus*.

III. Pellean (*Pelleam, Pellehan, Pellehem*).

This name—it is impossible to say with certainty which variant is the original one—does not occur at all in the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337, and in the whole Vulgate cycle it occurs only twice, viz., in the *Queste*, VI, 144, though not in all MSS, and in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290. To what extent it is found in the MSS of the latter passage we are unable to say, since collations of the MSS of the *Estoire* are wanting. In any event, considering the close relations of *Queste* and *Estoire*, the name, no doubt, passed directly from the manuscripts of the one romance into those of the other, and so, in all likelihood, we are really not confronted here with two different sources of independent value.

Take first the *Queste* passage. Most of the MSS, Sommer tells us (*ibid.*, n. 9) make Perceval's sister say to him at this point: "ie sui uostre seur & fille al roi Pellehem [or Pellean and other variant spellings]."

Inasmuch as Sommer names only five of the MSS which have the name Pellehem or Pellean in this place, we cannot determine whether the weight of manuscript authority, reckoning not merely by numbers, supports this as the true reading. M, which is, generally speaking, the best MS for the latter part of the Vulgate cycle, has here merely: "ie sui uostre seur," and "others, e.g., No. 343, *Bibl. Nat.*, and No. 4377 Phillip's (*sic*) collection, agree with M," as Sommer himself says. Perhaps M is right in the present passage, as it

certainly is in the *Mort Artu*, where, as against the overwhelming majority of MSS, it makes Morgan le Fay the chief lady of the ship which bears the wounded Arthur away to Avalon: see the record of the MS readings in my edition of the *Mort Artu* (p. 250, n. 2). In any case, no importance can be attached to this name, which occurs here alone (and not in all MSS) in the whole range of Arthurian romance as that of Perceval's father. Whether the scribe who was in the first instance responsible for the name in the present passage took it from the *Estoire*, I, 290, or as I believe, vice versa, it is, in any event and in all probability, simply the distortion of some one of the names of Perceval's father which we find in the other romances—most likely of Pellinor, who in the Huth *Merlin*, Portuguese *Demanda*, *Merlin* continuation of MS 337, and prose *Tristan* is that hero's father. It is to be noted that each is king of Listenois. For Pellinor cf. Vulgate *Merlin* (II, 346, 374), *Tristan* (pp. 38, 155, etc.), for Pellean cf. Huth *Merlin* (II, 30) and Spanish *Demanda* (pp. 107, 111). *Pellean* for *Pellinor* (the Portuguese *Demanda* in the corresponding passage actually has *Pellinor*) is a mild corruption for a mediaeval scribe, as unnumbered examples in the MSS of the Arthurian romances themselves—to go no further—sufficiently prove.¹ In MS A at this point we have not *Pellean* (*Pelleam*) or *Pellehem*, but merely *Pelle*; and the name Pellinor was easily subject to corruption, if the -or were written above the line, as is often the case in mediaeval MSS, and in an illegible hand. In the *Perlesvaus* MSS the name of Perceval's father (*nota bene!*), which was *Alain*, becomes distorted to *Julien*, *Julain*, *Vilain*.² The *Brulans* of the *Estoire*, I, 290, becomes *Urlains* in *Queste*, VI, 147. New characters occasionally come into existence in such instances through the failure of subsequent writers to recognize that the new names are merely manuscript corruptions of old ones. The best-known instance in the Arthurian romances is in the case of Gawain's brothers, *Gaheries* and *Guerrehes*. One of these names is merely a manuscript

¹ The fact is too well known to require illustration. Cf., for example, the variants in Sommer's Index or in E. Langlois' *Table des noms propres de toute nature compris dans les chansons de geste* (Paris, 1904), or in such an edition as that of the *Roman de Troie* by L. Constans (Paris, 1904-12) where all variants are recorded from the numerous MSS.

² Cf. W. A. Nitze's *Perlesvaus* dissertation, p. 110.

variation of the other.¹ They came to be accepted, however, as the names of separate characters, and, as such, run all through Arthurian romance. The Huth MS of Robert's *Merlin*, I, 120, somewhat in the same fashion and doubtless through a misunderstanding, makes two sisters out of Morgan le Fay, accepting for one the nominative form of her name, *Morgue(s)*, for the other the objective form, *Morgan(=Morgain)*. In *Escanor* (ll. 14365, 14389, 18857 ff.) new characters are created out of variants of Perceval's name (Percevaus, Pellesvaus). In consequence of MS corruptions of the name "Helins li Blons" (including the epithet), the scribes of the prose *Lancelot* have called into existence three brothers of the same name, only distinguished by varying corruptions of the original epithet; cf. Sommer's index under "Helys li Blois." The *Brulans* of the *Estoire*, mentioned above, yields in the same way *Garlans* in the Huth *Merlin*, II, 21 ff., who there plays a more extended rôle than *Brulans* did in the *Estoire*, although the connection with the dolorous stroke incident and the similarity to the corrupt variant, *Varlans*, recorded by Sommer (Index), prove that the two characters are certainly identical. Nearest of all to the corruption which I suppose in the case of Pellean's name are the variants for the name of the Grail Castle in Malory's *Morte Darthur*. In the *Queste* section of his work (e.g., pp. 644, 690, 717, in Sommer's edition) this name always appears as *Carbone(c)k*, in the *Lancelot* section (e.g., pp. 575, 580, 603), as *Corbyn*. The difference was probably already in Malory's French MSS. The loss of the last syllable here is just the same as I postulate in the case of *Pellean*.

Having finished with *Queste*, VI, 144, let us turn now to the passage in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290. The passage in the MS which Sommer reproduces reads as follows:

Après le roy Iambor [i.e., the descendant of Bron whom the pagan king, *Brulans*, had slain with King David's sword] regna li rois pelleam son fil,

¹ On this subject see Miss J. L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 247, n. 2, and E. Brugger, *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXXI (1907), 144 ff. In the H. Morf *Festschrift* (Halle, 1905), p. 83, the latter remarks on this phenomenon, but his examples are not very satisfactory.

A good example, outside of the Arthurian romances, is the creation by manuscript alteration of a new divinity, *Demogorgon*, out of *demiourgon* (Plato's demiurge) in the commentary on Statius (*Thebais*, IV, 516) by Lactantius Placidus; cf. G. Knaack, *Zeitschr. für vergleich. Literaturgeschichte, Neue Folge*, XII, 22 ff. From Boccaccio to Shelley this spurious divinity has cut no insignificant figure in literature. Not one of Shelley's editors has recognized the true origin of the character.

qui fu mahaig(nie) de .ij. cuisses en vne bataille de rome & pour le mah(a)ig quil rechut en cele bataille lapelerent tuit cil qui le connurent le roy mahaigie por ce quil ne pot garir de la plaie deuant ce que galaad le tres bon cheualier le uendra uisiter. Mais lors sans faille sera il garis. Et de celui descendoit vns rois qui ot a non pelles, biaux cheualiers & preus durement.

The passage goes on to say that Galahad, son of Pelles' daughter, brought to an end the adventures of the Holy Grail. On the other hand, in the MS followed by Hucher, *Le Saint Graal*, III, 295, the passage reads:

Apries le roy Lambor regna Pellehans et ses fieus qui fu mahaigies, etc.

Probably, however, Sommer's text is correct, and the *et* (or its symbol) after *Pellehans* in Hucher's MS was an unwarranted insertion. Similarly, in the *Queste*, VI, 185, MS R (cf. Sommer, n. 11), by the insertion of "&," makes two persons out of the elder Galahad, king of Hozelice.

Now the *Estoire*, as Arthurian scholars (except Heinzel, pp. 129 f.) are pretty generally agreed, is later than the *Queste*, although in the extant MSS they have been reciprocally adjusted to each other. Its author, then, doubtless derived this name from some MS of the *Queste* that had the reading *Pellean* (*Pellehan*) in the present passage. It is to be observed, however, that in the *Estoire* the name is given not to the father of Perceval, but to the father of Pelles—identified here with the (generally) unnamed *roi mahaigie*. With this discrepancy, it does no good to assume a lost common source. We are confronted simply with one of the arbitrary namings (or shiftings of relationship) of subordinate characters of the Grail cycle¹ which we meet with everywhere in the Grail romances. Either the author of the *Estoire*, as suggested above, or a scribe—in the absence of MS collations, we cannot say which—applied the name of a king connected in a *Queste* MS with the Grail circle to another king connected with the Grail circle. He may have done it deliberately or he may have done it through a confusion of memory. Either is possible.

It should be repeated that nowhere except in the *Queste* passage discussed above does *Pellean* appear again as Perceval's father.

¹ We have seen, for instance, that Perceval's father bears six different names in as many romances. Galahad's mother is called in *Lancelot*, III, 29, Amite (with variant spellings) or Helizabel—in the English *Merlin* and Malory, Elaine. And so on.

The character, who, as I have maintained, owes his existence to a scribal blunder, passed into the pseudo-Robert cycle (Huth *Merlin*,¹ Spanish *Demanda*²)—probably from the above-quoted passage of the *Estoire*, I, 290—but he is not Perceval's father in that cycle and he plays there an insignificant rôle, which surely does not comport with the supposition that he had ever been accepted seriously as Perceval's father.

The name does not occur in the Didot *Perceval* or in the *Perlesvaus*, and in the prose *Tristan* we find it merely as an unauthorized MS variant for *Pelles* in one passage (Löseth, p. 250).³

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

¹ II, 7, 21–28. The Huth MS is, unfortunately, defective in this episode (pp. 21–28), the only one in which Pellean appears as an actor. Paris, *ibid.*, II, 27, n. 1, summarizes the corresponding passage in Malory.

² Bonilla's edition, pp. 107–11.

³ Before leaving the subject, I should say that Sommer has proposed in *Romania*, XXXVI (1907), 552, an etymology for *Pellehem*, *Pellean*, etc., viz., *Pel-alein* or *Pel-helain*, which would be a combination of *Pelles* and *Alain*.

Nitze, in his well-known article, "The Fisher King in the Grail Romances," *PMLA*, XXIV (1909), 379, n. 2, appears to have arrived at the same etymology independently. Owing, however, to the conditions which I have analyzed above, the explanation which I have offered seems to me preferable.

After the first section of this article had passed through the press, I observed that A. N. Wesselofsky, *Archiv für Slavische Philologie*, XXIII (1901), 374 f., had already proposed to derive *Pelles* from *Peleus* (*Pelleus*), but on grounds which I cannot accept. He makes the impossible identification of *Pelles* with *Pellean*, who, as we have seen, suffered the dolorous stroke, and then identifies the spear of this stroke with the spear which, according to the classical legend, the centaur Chelron gave to *Peleus* and which is commonly known as the spear of Achilles (son of *Peleus*). This spear had the power of healing the wound which it inflicted.

STUDIES IN BALZAC

II. CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF REALISM¹

I. DEFINITION

The terms "realism and naturalism" have been bandied about until, like worn coins, their value is scarcely discernible. To add to the confusion, there is some authority for using the two words interchangeably. But for present purposes it is best to discriminate and define, and on the whole French and English critics leave one with the conviction that it is justifiable to make between realism and naturalism a distinction both of time and of degree. Chronologically, in nineteenth-century fiction, the best work of Balzac and of Flaubert stands for the earlier development of realism; while Zola and his school pushed that doctrine to its farthest extreme and baptized it *le Naturalisme*. To support the distinction, I may recall that M. Lanson does not include Balzac under his treatment of naturalism, which is happily defined by Mr. Wright² as an "acute form" of realism.

Then what is realism? Can we still say, as Littré did in the eighties, that it is an "attachement à la reproduction de la nature sans idéal"?³ But today we think of the "nature sans idéal" as rather the fetish of the naturalists. It is true that certain French critics, including Brunetière, use *réaliste* and *naturaliste* as practically synonymous. Else it would be difficult for Brunetière to maintain (for all his fulminations against the latter-day school) that "les romans de Balzac ne sont des romans que dans la mesure où ils sont naturalistes"; that Balzac was a naturalist in all senses of the word and that his excellence is to be judged by the degree to which he

¹ The first study in this series appeared in *Modern Philology*, XIII (1915), pp. 193-213, under the title of "Balzac and Cooper: *Les Chouans*." The present article attempts a synthesis of the various critical views of French realism, with the object of disengaging its qualities and factors as revealed in the *Comédie humaine*. The third study will deal with Balzac's method in general, and the fourth with the realistic method of one particular work.

² C. H. C. Wright, *History of French Literature*, p. 757.

³ Littré, *s.v.*

followed that doctrine.¹ Evidently Brunetière uses what he calls "le vrai naturalisme" as equivalent to our "realism," and it is in this sense that he defines the adjective, "naturalistes, c'est-à-dire . . . conformes à la réalité de la vie."² It is also in this sense that he quotes a seventeenth-century definition: "L'opinion qu'on appelle *naturaliste* . . . est celle qui estime nécessaire l'exacte imitation de la nature en toutes choses."

Call it which you please, we have in this passage a classic war-cry extended to the concreter realism, though the word "nature" still remains vague. That subject-matter is better delimited by Duranty, who probably gave points to Zola, in his journal entitled *le Réalisme*. He defines this term as "la reproduction exacte, complète, sincère, du milieu social, de l'époque où l'on vit."³ Thus in 1857—the date of *Madame Bovary*—the main articles of the creed were already posited as these four: exactness, completeness or universality of representation, truth, and the socio-historical approach.

The distinctions, from Brunetière's austere standpoint, between realism and naturalism are well stated in the *Avertissement* to *Le Roman naturaliste*.⁴ Brunetière says he wrote this book in order to "opposer les conditions d'un art vraiment naturaliste, qui sont: la probité de l'observation, la sympathie pour la souffrance, l'indulgence aux humbles, et la simplicité de l'exécution, aux caractères les plus généraux du naturalisme contemporain, lesquels sont au contraire la superstition de l'écriture 'artiste,' le pessimisme littéraire, et la recherche de la grossièreté."

Omitting the more exotic elements of the first formula, and bearing in mind especially the practice of Balzac and Flaubert, we may now arrive at a working definition of realism: It is the art of representing actuality, viewed largely from the material standpoint, in a way to produce as closely as possible the impression of truth.

¹ Brunetière, *Honoré de Balzac*, pp. 134-35.

² *Ibid.*, p. 136.

³ Quoted by Wright, p. 760.

⁴ Pp. II-III. Cf. Sainte-Beuve's famous diatribe, in *Nouveaux lundis*, IV, 137-38, where the critic, admitting reality to be the "fond de la vie," yet protests against mere photography and flatness and insists upon the adjuncts of style, sentiment, and idealism. In connection with *Madame Bovary*, Sainte-Beuve defined the qualities of the new realism as "science, esprit d'observation, maturité, force, un peu de dureté," *Causeries du lundi*, XIII, 363.

As for naturalism, it is virtually a *reductio ad absurdum* of the foregoing. The daring doctrine of Zola and Huysmans that Balzac was the master, whose method should be broadened by that of Stendhal to cover the psychological field, has really landed them in a field of quite another character. And their desire to exhibit "la vérité toute nue" has justified such epigrams as that of Saintsbury: "The ambition of the Naturalists was to mention the unmentionable with as much fulness of detail as possible."¹ Balzac may have instituted the exploitation of *la bête humaine*, but the naturalist who made the phrase famous was obsessed by its half-truth; the naturalist, says Meredith, "sees only the hog in nature and then takes nature for the hog."

II. GENERAL QUALITIES

In trying to establish a definition of realism, I have been led to anticipate its more usual qualities. Including those already given, as well as other more debatable characteristics, I submit the following list of features ascribable to various brands of realistic fiction. Reserving until later questions relative to technique and *procédés*, here are the main possibilities that realism presents in the realm of ideas:

- Truth, or correspondence with objective reality
- Materialism: Animalism, money, externality
- Impersonality
- The scientific viewpoint
- The claim to universality
- The documentary method, or technical erudition
- Tediousness
- Representation of mediocrity and triviality
- Solidity
- Sympathy with ordinary life
- Sociological features

Let us take these in order. The question of truth, as applied to any given picture of life, is usually the most difficult to decide. If a critic asks himself, Does this correspond to life as I know it?, the answer will frequently be, No. But one should proceed to a

¹ *History of French Literature*, p. 564.

further question, Does this correspond to life as I can readily conceive of it? Is it *vraisemblable*, if not absolutely *vrai*? And is the representation self-consistent? Then the answer, drawn from a good realist, is usually, Yes. In other words, the truth in Balzac may sometimes be a matter of simply reporting facts, but more frequently it will be a matter of transmuting and raising facts to the value of coherent and plausible symbols.

The critics are almost unanimous in praising Balzac's knowledge of reality and his power of conveying it in transmuted terms. "This is where Balzac remains unshaken," says Henry James, "—in our feeling that with all his faults . . . , his spirit has somehow paid for its knowledge." And he compares the French novelist to Shakespeare for his "charged consciousness of truth and his direct exposure of sensibility."¹

Brunetière, in the *Roman naturaliste*, disconcerts us a little by declaring that "Balzac, à proprement parler, n'est pas un réaliste." But why not? Because he transforms reality, because he does not make a servile copy—like the naturalists, as we would say. Brunetière is again juggling with our terms, but his opinion of Balzac stands out clearly enough: "Il met dans les caractères une logique, et dans les développements de la passion une suite"—which they do not have in real life.² Does that impair the artistic verity of monomaniacs like the Baron Hulot or Old Grandet, who say and do almost nothing that is not related to their master-passion? Brunetière, at least, does not think so. "Ils sont donc vrais . . . et ils sont vrais précisément en tant qu'ils cessent d'être réels."³ Elsewhere this critic declares that no one has the faculty of arriving at truth like Balzac and that in spite of his romantic side-shows, his grandiose characters and his crude mysticism, the *Comédie humaine* is largely a rehabilitation of "l'humble vérité."⁴

Similarly Saintsbury marvels at the novelist's "power of conferring apparent reality upon what the reader nevertheless feels to be imaginary and ideal. Everything is seen through a kind of distorting lens, yet the actual vision is defined with the most extraordinary

¹ H. James, *The Question of Our Speech; the Lesson of Balzac*, p. 94.

² *Roman naturaliste*, p. 5.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁴ *Honoré de Balzac*, pp. 127, 133.

precision and in the most vivid colors."¹ By the "actual vision," I suppose Saintsbury means the detailed presentment of each particular scene. If so, he agrees with Balzac's own dictum in the celebrated *Avant-propos de la Comédie humaine*: the law of the novel is to "tendre vers le beau idéal. . . . Mais le roman ne serait rien si, dans cet auguste mensonge, il n'était pas vrai dans les détails."² And elsewhere Balzac significantly reproves those vague idealists, like George Sand, who "courent dans le vide."

Balzac then told the truth—granted. But did he tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth? The phrases about the *auguste mensonge* and the "distorting lens" would make us doubt it, if we did not doubt it already. In that process of transmuting and solidifying reality, did he not mix some strange elements in the alembic? Romantic and melodramatic exaggeration of character and incident certainly play a large part in his novels. It seems clear also that, like Zola and the Goncourts, Balzac dwelt willingly on the exceptional and even the pathological. Leslie Stephen declares that no such world as Balzac's was possible, because no such world could have continued to exist.³ But due allowance must of course be made for the romancer's right to choose the extraordinary, even the criminally interesting.

It scarcely seems likely that Balzac laid equal emphasis on all sides of truth. Fromentin is quoted as saying of the naturalists: "Ils avaient l'air de révolutionnaires, parce qu'ils n'affectaient d'admettre que la moitié des vérités nécessaires."⁴ And Balzac himself laments that, since he painted things as they are, it has been foolishly said "que j'appartenais à l'école sensualiste et matérialiste."⁵

On the whole, his work does produce a materialistic effect. There is no denying it, and his own denials, it has been pointed out, are perfunctory.⁶ He was as frank a Rabelaisian as any, he believed in force, food, money, and things, and the real issue is to discover to

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 511.

² *Œuvres* (M. Lévy edition), I, 10.

³ *Hours in a Library*, I, 312. Yet Stephen admits Balzac's "intense realization of actors and scenery" and his "patient Dutch" artistry (pp. 271, 278).

⁴ Quoted by Brunetière, *Rom. nat.*, p. 49.

⁵ *Œuvres*, I, 11.

⁶ Pellissier, *Le mouvement littéraire au dix-neuvième siècle*, p. 250.

what fictional values his materialism led him. Here one may consider Brunetière's onslaught against materialistic, especially naturalistic fiction: "C'est un art qui sacrifie la forme à la matière, le dessin à la couleur, le sentiment à la sensation, l'idéal au réel; qui ne recule ni devant la trivialité, la brutalité même, qui parle enfin son langage à la foule."¹ Among the questions that will repay investigation are these: does Balzac sacrifice form to matter, and if so, what is the effect on his style? Does he pile on sensations, colors, coarseness of language and treatment? Is he, like Zola, constantly comparing human beings to animals, according to the theory of the *Avant-propos*?² Or has he affinities with Stendhal, materializing psychology in terms of "la sensation, la physiologie, le fatalisme du tempérament?"³

It is evident that Balzac's materialism will affect the method and quantity of his description. Both Brunetière and Taine give a certain progression, the first logical, the second both logical and to some extent actual in its application to the novelist's method. Balzac, says the former, introduced the treatment of these chief material preoccupations: living, which depends upon eating, which depends upon money, which depends upon work, which depends upon a trade or profession. Then and thus would come the handling of "la diversité des conditions, chacune caractérisée par les traits qui lui sont propres," manifest in descriptions as well as in technically suitable dialogues and the very manipulations of the plot.⁴

The space given to money and to business affairs is among the most salient features of Balzac's work. His own business ventures gave him a knowledge in this field which he used better for imaginary people than for his own prosperity. He insists always on the importance of incomes and investments. Does he make these, e.g., in *Eugénie Grandet*, correspond to the knowledge and nature of the particular character? Such novels as *Le Cousin Pons* and *César Birotteau* require, in their different ways, very careful following of the financial moves. Even the careless young men of the Pension

¹ *Rom. nat.*, p. 3.

² The use of this analogy, which may be called animalism, will be more fully treated in the third study of this series.

³ Pellissier, p. 245.

⁴ *Rom. nat.*, pp. 63-64. For Taine's analysis of this, see subsequent study.

Vauquer, as Gautier points out, do not live poetically in the "mansardes de convention" and eat "des mets simples apprêtés par la main de la nature."¹ They are figured out much closer than that. Brunetière thinks Taine stresses too admiringly Balzac's preoccupation with the money basis. Not even a "naturalistic" novel should repose entirely on this foundation and money probably occupies less place in life than Balzac thought—"et pour cause."²

To pass to the next quality, does all this materialism of treatment mean that Balzac's world is mainly external, that he lacks psychological and spiritual insight? The consensus of opinion is that he lacks the second but not usually the first. Then how are his "souls" made up, if he shows us mainly the environment of body? What is his recipe for fusing a character out of a soul apparently considered at best only as a collection of qualities and sentiments? I do not know that one can answer such a question, for it may be that here we touch the secret of genius, the power of divination that Balzac accorded himself and that others have accorded him. But perhaps we can trace some of the ways in which Balzac at his best avoids the reproach of threatening externality. Brunetière suggests one way when he says that such books as *Eugénie Grandet* are not fortuitous masses of notes collected before the conception of the masterpiece and then crowded in. They are rather "œuvres composées par le dedans, et non pas fabriquées par le dehors." Therefore "la bricabrakologie" occupies here only its lawful place.³ Still, in the lesser works—and in the high-life characters—one may suspect the predominance of bric-a-brac over psychology.

The claims of realism to impersonality and universality of treatment are closely connected with its scientific pretensions. We know how Flaubert fought for the impartial accent and how nearly he reached it in *Madame Bovary*. Zola makes of this "désintéressement" one of his chief doctrinal points. "Le romancier naturaliste affecte de disparaître complètement derrière l'action qu'il raconte." Such an attitude, he says, brings about the absence of moral judgments or indeed of any conclusiveness. Let us have nothing but

¹ Gautier, *Portraits contemporains*, p. 77.

² *Rom. nat.*, p. 65.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

facts. "L'auteur n'est pas un moraliste, mais un anatomiste qui se contente de dire ce qu'il trouve dans le cadavre humain." And he objects that Balzac is continually obtruding his own personality.¹

Now it is true that Balzac frequently interrupts the story with rather inartistic remarks. But what is their nature? Are they simply flamboyant interjections or do they constitute the more serious interference of partial or aggressively moral judgments? In any conflict, does he show too decidedly to which side he leans? If so, one may criticize his pretension to exploit all his known world in a highly scientific and self-suppressing manner.

Here is his famous statement of the scientific (biological) idea, in the *Avant-propos*.² After saying that his conception of the *Comédie* as an organism came from a comparison "entre l'humanité et l'animalité," he remarks on the triumph of Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, who showed the unity of composition of life (transformism) as modified into species by environment. Then: "Je vis que sous ce rapport, la société ressemblait à la nature. La société ne fait-elle pas de l'homme, suivant les milieux où son action se déploie, autant d'hommes différents qu'il y a de variétés en zoologie?" The conclusion is that there are "des espèces sociales comme il y a des espèces zoologiques."

Whatever the false analogies, the fertile consequences of this theory for Balzac's fiction impose themselves. It means primarily the division of mankind into trades and professions. It should mean the scientific attitude in the collection and presentation of facts. It should also mean, as Brunetière points out, not only an objectivity from the self-standpoint, but objectivity from the human standpoint, with a tendency to discard all anthropomorphism.³ Correspondingly, one may expect a certain interest in and development of other sciences—or pseudo-sciences—with the result that the whole earth may be viewed as a sphere for impartial observation. That is the universality I am speaking of, the realistic universality, which is to be carefully distinguished from the classical (Aristotelian) and romantic kinds. "La société française allait être l'historien, je ne

¹ Zola, *Les Romanciers naturalistes*, pp. 128-30.

² *Œuvres*, I, 2.

³ *Honoré de Balzac*, p. 161.

devais être que le secrétaire"¹—but a secretary who recorded all contemporary history. The *Comédie humaine* will then be a social organism, with its parts linked by the reappearing characters.

The next step will be in the documentary direction. Science, objects Brunetière, now tries to persuade artists "que toutes leurs 'observations,' même les plus vulgaires . . . par la seule vérité du détail et la fidélité photographique de la reproduction, conservent pour l'avenir une valeur assurée de témoignage historique."² In Balzac, two kinds of "documents" may be expected: technical disquisitions by the author, with display of erudition in many special fields, and the use of such actual documents as a proclamation by Napoleon or a business prospectus. More widely, there is the conscientious care in "getting up" a subject, the method of Flaubert in *Salammbô*. With reference to this work, Brunetière has a whole damnable article on "L'Erudition dans le roman."³ He also finds Balzac too much addicted to this specialization. The novelist's curiosity led him into various *enquêtes*, which transform several stories into so many "recueils de documents." *Le Cousin Pons*, for instance, contains half-a-dozen complete biographies which seem superfluous.⁴ Are they really so, or do they sufficiently justify themselves by furnishing that *scientific* solid basis which Brunetière admits? He objects more particularly to "le document physiologique et surtout pathologique." But diseases and deathbeds have their interest both of psychological revelation and of dramatic suspense.

The real dangers of the documentary method are, first, that art and science should not be identified in their aims and technique and, second, that the scientific pretensions of a Zola or a Balzac are likely to be based on superficial knowledge and a mistaken use of science. But be it science or pseudo-science, one is not dispensed from seeking the results, artistic or the reverse, of such influences upon Balzac's fiction. It is generally admitted that positivism and naturalism have many links, of which Taine's essay on Balzac is not the sole example. The novelist is characterized by Oscar Wilde⁵ as offering

¹ *Œuvres*, I, 5.

² *Rom. nat.*, p. 6.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 27-48.

⁴ *Honoré de Balzac*, pp. 155, 158.

⁵ In *The Decay of Lying*.

a "most remarkable combination of the artistic temperament with the scientific spirit." It is the latter quality which led Balzac to say and prove that his work had its geography, as it had its genealogy, places, things, persons, and facts.¹ One should then trace out Balzac's divisions and treatment of knowledge, observing how the artist's hand often modified the raw material.

Let us not claim that it always did so. Let us admit the charges of frequent tediousness and ponder its causes. Taine himself admits that Balzac's pedantry is often misplaced. For instance: "Mme Claës, au lit de mort, laisse échapper des allusions physiologiques et des axiomes métaphysiques dont heureusement elle était incapable." This then is the semi-scientific author, talking behind his character, with "ses grands mots, son argot scientifique, son fatras philosophique."²

Again, long-windedness may proceed from the superstition of universality, from the compulsion to tell everything. Is it true, as Wright says, that it is especially in Balzac's financial operations that we find "his documentary method, the detailed reproduction of procedure"?³ And this critic, among many others, complains of the tediousness of "description and enumeration, to the complete neglect of the plot." We shall have opportunity to test this apparent exaggeration; yet be it noted that even Taine observes that Balzac too often keeps us waiting and the essayist bluntly adds: "Il est désagréable de faire antichambre."⁴ Descriptions are too long and, what is perhaps more serious, they are sometimes obscure or not synthesized. "Une description n'est pas une peinture . . . ces compilations ne font rien voir." Only professional physiognomists could see the importance of the Chevalier de Valois' nose, as lengthily portrayed. Such long-windedness, Taine adds, "fausse l'impression," for the imagination sees the object in a flash.⁵ A Balzacian description should then be tested in these respects: does it harmonize solidly, does it lead us to visualize, does it require shortening? As will be seen later, a description does frequently harmonize around a central keynote.

¹ *Œuvres*, I, 14.

² Taine, *Nouveaux essais de critique et d'histoire*, p. 74.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 722.

⁴ Taine, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

Through lack of restraint, it is certain that latter-day naturalists have drifted into a patient and pointless recording of everything, with a tendency toward mediocrity and triviality of representation. Zola thus defends the method. A typically naturalistic hero must be mediocre. To stage grand or gigantic protagonists, he says, is quite romantic—and Balzacian! Beauty does not consist in enlarging anything, since “an equal level abases all heads”; it consists rather “dans la vérité indiscutable du document humain.”¹

This is sternly intransigent, and we scarcely expect Balzac to measure up to that uninteresting standard. We may find that he still frequently gives heroic proportions to his figures, while making their *circumstances* mediocre or trivial. Brunetière objects to the realistic mania for reflecting “avec une minutieuse et puérile exactitude les moindres accidents de la réalité” and holds that one may represent the humblest lives and their circumstances only on this broad condition: “que dans la profondeur de leur abaissement on fasse luire un rayon d’idéal.”² Even “tales of mean streets” should be lifted from their environment and sympathetically universalized.

What results from the foregoing as to the two qualities of solidity of workmanship, on the one hand, and of sympathy with ordinary life on the other? Henry James, who thinks of our novelist as toiling through triviality “with huge feet fairly ploughing the sand of our desert,” nevertheless roundly declares that “Balzac stands almost alone as an extemporizer achieving closeness and weight, and whom closeness and weight have preserved. . . . Quantity and intensity are at once and together his sign . . . [he] did not press hard in some places only to bear lightly in others,” by falling into shallowness or sketchiness. Balzac doesn’t throw dust in our eyes. He “goes in . . . for a portentous clearness, a reproduction of the real on the scale of the real. Though . . . clearness sometimes fails”—that is, *we* fail to see the forest for the trees.³ Later, James states that “Balzac, like nature herself, abhorred a vacuum.”⁴

How is this effect of solidity attained in detail? It is admitted even by Brunetière, even for the half-dozen *dossiers* in *Le Cousin Pons*.

¹ Zola, *Romanciers naturalistes*, pp. 127–28.

² *Rom. nat.*, pp. 7, 11.

³ James, *The Lesson of Balzac*, pp. 70–79.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

The most remote of these help to constitute *milieu* in the first place, and in the second they establish the characters, so to speak, on the *outside* of the story's needs and therefore in a kind of real life.¹ But is it worth while to build up an elaborate past for secondary characters in order that their brief appearances on the scene may accord with the careful "preparations" for their rôles? At any rate: "c'est ce qui donne aux 'dessous' des romans de Balzac leur incomparable solidité."

But Brunetière does not try to make out a case for Balzac as a sympathizer with humble life. That trait he finds mainly in the exotic realists, in Dickens and George Eliot, in Dostoevsky and other Russians. One should compare George Eliot's serenity, her large patience and penetration into the "lot" of the humble, with the sentimental "galimatias" of *Le Lys dans la Vallée*.² The danger of an overdone sympathy is, however, the danger of sentimentality. Pathos becomes bathos and the pathetic is really an inferior *genre*, because it confuses "l'émotion presque physique et l'émotion d'art."³

How does the main truth of this argument affect Balzac? Does it leave him merely sentimental in his not very frequent passages of pathos? Above all, does it leave him, with reference to the ordinary trend of life, sufficiently interested to retain our interest, whether or not he is moved to more overt sympathy?

The sociological preoccupations of Balzac have already been suggested in quotations from the *Avant-propos*⁴ and the subject will receive in a subsequent study the full treatment that it merits. I may indicate here that the *roman de mœurs* is, of its nature, concerned with social types, and that the titles of Balzac's novels frequently suggest his interest in a social status, category, or institution. The greater part of his generalizations and side remarks are also of this character. Brunetière emphasizes these sociological aspects of the *Comédie humaine*: the universality of depiction, the representation by classes, with close study of their *ressorts*, Balzac's crusade in behalf of the family, his Comtism and Catholicism.⁵

¹ *Honoré de Balzac*, pp. 156-57.

² *Rom. nat.*, pp. 210-23, *passim*.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁴ See *supra*, p. 358.

⁵ *Honoré de Balzac*, pp. 165 ff.

III. TECHNICAL ELEMENTS

In this division I will only throw out suggestions and provide a working skeleton which can be amplified or arranged to suit each novel. Balzac's fiction will offer generally these elements for analysis:

EXPOSITION: Topography. Order of the *données*. Quantity of space.

PLOT AND COMPOSITION: Cumulative effect. Use of documents and episodes.

CHARACTERS: Accumulation. Harmonizing. Order of the biographical and psychological data.

DESCRIPTION:

1. Subjects

- a) Persons and dress (gestures, keynotes).
- b) Indoor *milieu*.
- c) Outdoor *milieu*. Topography.
- d) Historical background—local color.
- e) Of conditions and manners.

2. Kinds

- a) *En masse*, centered or not.
- b) By scattered detail—repetitions, etc.

DETAIL: Multiplicity; characteristic or causal; vivid and picturesque; exact and historical; unrelated or insignificant.

STYLE:

- 1. Kind: Materialistic, technical, "artiste," cumbersome, colorless, or simple.
- 2. Components: Diction (proper names), technical terms, dialogue, figures, etc.

A Balzacian exposition, like the head of a comet, bulks larger than the rest and frequently tries the patience of the reader. The first thirty or forty pages, especially if there is no break¹ in the volume, will furnish most of the matter for analysis. Much might be quoted from Balzac in defense of his long expositions and descriptions. Occasionally he is apologetic, but more usually he is downright in declaring that such and such a preamble, topographical, socio-historical, or biographical, is essential to the thorough understanding of what follows. That is what the reader should decide

¹ In spite of the usual solid printing of the *Comédie humaine*, Balzac intended that chapter headings and divisions should appear.

in each individual case. Is it better, for instance, to give the personal history of a character at the beginning, simply and perhaps tiresomely, in the old-fashioned way? Or is it better to adopt the method of *in medias res*, as Brunetière praises it in Flaubert: to begin the story at once, then presently "immobilize" the person in a suitable moment of revery and recall within him the previous train of action?¹ In about one-third of his stories, Balzac uses some form of beginning *in medias res*; the question would be why he does so. Another arrangement, as employed by the clever technicians of our rapid days, is to avoid mass at any cost and scatter all forms of description and "informations"² in broken fragments throughout.

Is a Balzacian plot a simple or a complex affair? It is said to be fairly simple when the author is mainly interested in displaying character,³ and it is known to be very complex in such studies as *César Birotteau* and *Une Ténébreuse affaire*, which would require, according to Taine,⁴ a financier and a magistrate respectively to follow perfectly their convolutions. Occasionally we have a compound rather than a complex plot. The doubtfully cohering parts of *Le Cousin Pons* or of the *Histoire des Treize* provide a plot of this character. Several critics⁵ show how *La Femme de trente ans* is probably the worst case of such patchwork. It consists of six originally distinct short stories, hastily joined together. The heroine had for a time six names and she remains to this day six different characters.

But the critics⁶ mostly agree that Balzac's composition is usually of a superior kind, granting that he is at liberty to do something besides narrate. Admitting episodes, "encyclopedic zeal," documents of various kinds and descriptions galore, it is nevertheless contended that he fuses and inspires all this with his central idea. The point then is in each case to determine how such material is linked with the action of the story.

¹ *Le Roman naturaliste*, pp. 161, 163.

² Together, often, with dialogue and narration itself—a sort of driving four-in-hand. Flaubert's "tableaux" (e.g., the *comices agricoles*) probably set the pace for this technique.

³ Lawton, *Balzac*, p. 93.

⁴ *Nouveaux essais*, p. 71.

⁵ Lovenjoul, Le Breton, Lawton.

⁶ Taine, H. James, etc.

In narration proper, is the action swift or dilatory? Is it frequently "decomposed" into so many itemized parts, or what is the novelist's recipe for suggesting the flight of time in a way to combine artistic plausibility with few and simple indications? This has been praised as one of Balzac's best devices. Does he narrate by rapid dialogue in the manner of Dumas *père* and the *roman-feuilleton*? Perhaps the very simplicity of the straight narrative portions will leave them realistic and natural enough,¹ but less susceptible of analysis than the descriptions.

Balzac's characters rise up amid a clattering environment. They need to be tremendously strong to pass Kipling's test of "standing on their feet," while, so to speak, their household goods sweep by in a flood. Therefore they are frequently monomaniacs, they are possessed by a ruling passion that dominates the book. "Mais ces types énormes," says Lanson, "sont réels, à force de détermination morale et physique."² Are they rather types than characters, or are they great as both? Balzac's own ideal was that they should "faire concurrence à l'état civil."³ Are the secondary characters equally differentiated and by what means? If they bear mainly trade-marks, they may incur Brunetière's dry objection that being a hardware merchant or a cobbler need not greatly differentiate the quality of one's loves or hates.⁴ Any character may become stressed by the repetition of a favorite *tic* or "gag," and the unrealistic side of Balzac may plunge him into the grotesque⁵ by way, perhaps, of reaction against dullness and triviality.

As to descriptions, much has already been said. In general, they may be examined for long-windedness and for the relationship of parts. In particular, with reference to any person, one should notice how his dress, physiognomy, and very gestures give the clue to his personality. It is in this connection that the keynote in description may often be determined.⁶ Why is Vautrin repeatedly

¹ Even when the game is hampered by technical documentation, says Lanson, "on croit que c'est arrivé" (*Hist. de la litt. franç.*, [8th ed.], p. 989).

² *Loc. cit.*

³ *Œuvres*, I, 3.

⁴ *Le Roman naturaliste*, p. 132.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

⁶ See above, p. 360, and later, Study III.

said to have a "regard profond"? Why does Old Grandet stammer? What is the unifying feature of the detailed features of Marche-à-terre? What significance has the name of a character?

In passing to furniture and the like, one might ask, by way of transition, if Balzac often vivifies inanimate things in the manner of Hugo, Daudet, or Dickens, by making them serve as symbols or monsters. Here is his own opinion of the value of setting: "L'animal a peu de mobilier, il n'a ni arts ni sciences, tandis que l'homme, par une loi qui est à rechercher, tend à représenter ses mœurs, sa pensée et sa vie dans tout ce qu'il approprie à ses besoins."¹ This is the *coquille* idea: that the human animal leaves his imprint on his shell.² Brunetière doubts whether our way of dressing and our place of living are so universally linked with our manner of feeling.³ Yet he holds, somewhat contradictorily, that "les descriptions de Balzac ont toujours quelque raison d'être en dehors d'elles-mêmes" (whereas poetic and romantic description was its own excuse for being)—"et cette raison . . . étant toujours explicative des causes qui ont façonné dans le cours du temps les êtres ou les lieux, les descriptions de Balzac, rien qu'à ce titre, sont donc toujours historiques."⁴ That is, they will sometimes have a socio-historical rather than an immediately biographical value. Perhaps the house of the Claës, in the *Recherche de l'absolu*, would be a case in point.

When it comes to a wider topography, the same question of linking still asserts itself. Why, in *Les Chouans*, do we have such a minute description of the Breton countryside? What is the use made generally of local color and historical background? The former, by the way, besides dealing with customs, takes on frequently a philological aspect.

The description of conditions, status, etc., is supposed to be Balzac's *forte*. His novels are naturalistic, says Brunetière, "en premier lieu par la diversité des conditions qu'ils mettent en scène."⁵ In this connection only, the critic justifies the novelist's emphasis of money, as gained in a diversity of practical ways. Hence the

¹ *Œuvres*, I, 3.

² Cf. Taine, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

³ *Honoré de Balzac*, p. 175.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 136-40.

ways to gain it are described, made probable, and "realized" concretely in relation to each profession.

With reference to the kinds of description, it may be done *en masse* or *en détail*. In the former case, it should be noticed whether the whole thing is concentrated (as above mentioned) for one purpose or from one viewpoint. It is good art, for instance, to take the special viewpoint of a fictional observer and to describe nothing that he would not see. Or the description may be done from an inanimate viewpoint, as when Flaubert notes only those things that lie in the path of a ray of light. Did Balzac so restrict himself? It would be easier to find examples of his centering the description around a main idea, as in *Une Passion dans le désert*, where each touch added to the panther is in order to emphasize her resemblance to a woman. Incidentally, one should also observe the effect of repetitions and of *résumés*.

It is of course multiplied detail that makes a description, and there are those who affirm that Balzac multiplies where he should subtract. "This extravagance is his great fault," says Henry James, "in spite, too, of its all being detail vivified and related, characteristic and constructive."¹ Where is it essentially related and where not, and what effect has mere multiplicity and size upon the reader? Is it usually cumulative, and when it fails of this effect, is it because juxtaposition takes the place of coherence? At times there is certainly a plethora if not a mere juxtaposition of details in Balzac, and Brunetière even indicates this as his second chief claim to be called naturalistic—"par l'abondance, la précision et la minutie de ce genre de détails."² Where we do not recognize the necessity of this abundance, it may be due to our shortsightedness or it may be that Balzac is again possessed by the fetish of universality.

He himself assures us that there was a reason for everything he did. "En saisissant bien le sens de cette composition, on reconnaîtra que j'accorde aux faits constants, quotidiens . . . aux actes de la vie individuelle, à leurs causes et à leurs principes, autant d'importance que jusqu'alors les historiens en ont attaché aux événements de la vie publique des nations."³ That leads us to speak

¹ *The Lesson of Balzac*, p. 85.

² *Honoré de Balzac*, p. 143.

³ *Œuvres*, I, 12.

of the causal detail, as I have called it, the detail which is truly a joint in the harness. "Il voit avec les détails les lois qui les gouvernent."¹ In Balzac's elaborate scaffoldings, one must evidently test the individual beams, for it is again a question of solidity.

The characteristic detail is slightly different. It may be the crown of causes, it may be simply the salient or the summarizing feature by which we remember a person, a landscape, a season. Brunetière chooses from Flaubert a number which precisely hit off a season or an hour.² From *Le Cousin Pons* I may instance the dirty knocker to Fraasier's place of business and from *Le Père Goriot*, in the direction of contrast, the statue of Cupid in the garden of the *pension*. With regard to persons, the characteristic detail often becomes simply a "gag," as in the case of Daudet's lazy actor, "who had not the right to renounce his art."

The picturesque detail is sometimes one and the same with the foregoing, or it may exist primarily for its own vividness. For instance, it is a frequent touch in fiction, found both in Balzac and Flaubert, to have sunlight strike upon the weapons of a distant army, revealing it distinctly for that moment.³

The exact and technical kind of detail scarcely needs definition. Brunetière notes that a number of this kind are brought in through money dealings.⁴ Maigron, in his book on the influence of Sir Walter Scott, observes that Balzac drew from that author "cette foule de détails précis—les seuls caractéristiques"⁵—and then applied them to everyday life. Balzac's care for exactness in detail is well known. He and Stendhal were practically the first to set themselves a severe standard for the depiction of contemporary life with minute precision. Balzac's journeys in search of close local color, his zeal in seeking for the right house, the right street, the right name—witness the Z. Marcas story—often brought the right results. Sometimes it led him into insignificant, merely photographic or microscopic representation. Sometimes detail is really useless,

¹ Taine, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

² *Le Roman naturaliste*, p. 168.

³ At the beginning of *Les Chouans* and of *Salammbô*.

⁴ *Honoré de Balzac*, p. 140.

⁵ Maigron, *Le Roman historique à l'époque romantique*, p. 230.

whether it is true or not; but occasionally also it gets its effect through being apparently unrelated. It may serve for contrast, it may serve simply to illustrate the indifference of things, as when Tess of the d'Urbervilles is attended, at a critical moment in her fortunes, by a piece of soiled paper blowing aimlessly about.

As to style, I will briefly suggest the possibilities. It may have in different places any or several of the characteristics enumerated. If it is materialized to start with, that kind of style is likely to bring certain of the other qualities in its train. What Brunetière indicates for another novelist may occur in Balzac. There may be something "lourdement sensuel" even in presumably idyllic parts, or the design may disappear "sous l'empâtement des couleurs."¹ In the heavy and involved passages, Balzac seems deliberately to thicken the medium through his desire to tell everything. There will be found Rabelaisian catalogues, exclamatory and rhetorical sentences, above all masses of technical expressions, for the use of the *mot propre* is considered one of Balzac's prominent traits. His style is adapted to all circumstances and is therefore by turns simple or forceful, pedantic or technical, sometimes "artiste," sometimes neologic or smacking of what he called "la bricabracologie"—which term is itself a monstrous neologism. Taine calls this style a gigantic chaos and remarks what effects are attained by comparison (through analogy and figures) of the scientific with the sentimental world. For instance, he quotes a gorgeous passage in which love is expressed in terms of botany.²

Such figures as these are not infrequent, and one may recall how George Eliot's scientific interests worked in a similar direction. There is also the more usual class of simply natural figures, sometimes employed with strict appropriateness: a farmer or a soldier will draw his comparisons from his own field. It would be worth while to observe whether Balzac makes much use of that inverted type of figure which expresses nature by comparisons with art. This is opposed to the Aristotelian tradition but is, I believe, fairly common in the nineteenth century. Does our author affect the Flaubertian kind of figure which Brunetière defines as "la traduction

¹ *Le Roman naturaliste*, p. 15.

² *Nouveaux essais*, pp. 91-92.

du sentiment par quelque sensation exactement correspondante."¹ Certainly, here as elsewhere, Balzac leans to exactness and vividness, and it will be desirable to pick out those figures which show most of these qualities.

In criticizing dialogue, the question of naturalness and appropriateness to each character should come first. What about Hulot's military slang and Rastignac's description of high life? Is dialogue interspersed with description, for relief and illustration? One may note the arrangement of single speeches between paragraphs of description; also speeches in chorus and "sliced dialogue." Henry James holds firmly that dialogue, admirable for illustration, should not be used for constructive purposes, and he believes that Balzac followed this "law."² On the contrary, we will find that Balzac frequently uses dialogue in order to narrate; and often it forwards the story in a dramatic way, because it is the way of the drama.

In this introductory study, I have been occupied with stating problems according to the critics and the general probabilities. Subsequent studies will endeavor to solve or illustrate these problems, keeping mainly to the analysis of realism here given.

E. PRESTON DARGAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[To be continued]

¹ *Le Roman naturaliste*, pp. 156 f. An example would be Emma's dreams falling in the mud, like wounded swallows.

² James, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-12.

THE INDIVIDUAL HUMAN DRAMATIS PERSONAE OF THE *DIVINE COMEDY*

The main purpose of this study is to emphasize the vastness of the field of knowledge of legend, history, and contemporary affairs from which Dante drew the dramatis personae of his *Divine Comedy*. Mention will also be made of various matters of interest concerning the derivation, identification, and distribution of these characters.

Dante assigns 332 individual human dramatis personae to the three divisions of his after-world. This count excludes angels, demons,¹ the allegorical figures of the procession in the Earthly Paradise, persons mentioned but not assigned to one of the three divisions (e.g., Theseus, Guido Cavalcanti), and undifferentiated members of such groups as the "più di mille Ombre" of *Inf.* V, 67-68. Those whose names appear in Roman type in the following lists are located in Hell; italic type indicates location in Purgatory; small capitals indicate location in Paradise. Those whose names are parenthesized are not seen by Dante. Those whose names are preceded by an asterisk speak.

I have used Professor C. H. Grandgent's edition of the *Divina commedia*, relying on his decision in cases of disputed identity. I have also used the notes to the Torraca text, Paget Toynbee's *Dante Dictionary*, G. A. Scartazzini's *Enciclopedia dantesca*, and E. G. Gardner's *Dante*. I am chiefly indebted to Professor E. H. Wilkins for assistance in this work.

A. The Bible (48 persons):

- I. Old Testament (33): (ABEL), (ABRAHAM), *ADAM, DAVID, EVE, HEZEKIAH, (ISAAC), (JACOB), ([TWELVE] SONS OF JACOB), JOSHUA, MOSES, NATHAN THE PROPHET, *Nimrod, (NOAH), Potiphar's Wife, RACHEL, RAHAB, REBECCA, RUTH, (SAMUEL), SARAH, *SOLOMON.
- II. Apocrypha (2): JUDAS MACCABAEUS, JUDITH.
- III. New Testament (13): ANNA, (ANNAS), Caiaphas, CHRIST, DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE, *JAMES, *JOHN, JOHN THE BAPTIST, Judas, MARY, (PAUL), *PETER, (Simon Magus).

¹ But includes Cacus and the Giants, who are being punished for their sins on earth.

B. Greek (58):

I. Legend (37): Achilles, Aeneas, Amphiarus, Antaeus, (Antigone), (Argia), (Briareus), Cacus, *Capaneus, (Deidamia), (Deidamia's Sisters),¹ (Deiphile), Diomed, Electra, Ephialtes, Eurypylus, Hector, Helen, (Hypsipyle), (Ismene), Jason, Manto, Myrra, Orpheus, Paris, Penthesilea, (Pyrrhus), RIPHEUS, Semiramis, Sinon, Thais, (Thetis), Tiresias, (Tityos), (Typhon), *Ulysses.

II. History to 100 A.D. (21): (Agathon), Alexander, Anaxagoras, (Antiphon), Aristotle, Democritus, Diogenes, Dionysius of Syracuse, Dioscorides, Empedocles, (Epicurus), Euclid, (Euripides), Heraclitus, Hippocrates, *Homer, Plato, (Simonides), Socrates, Thales, Zeno.

C. Roman (31):

I. Legend (4): Camilla, Dido, Latinus, Lavinia.

II. History to 100 A.D. (27):

1. Kingdom (2): Lucius Junius Brutus, Lucretia.

2. Republic (15): Aruns, Brutus, (Caecilius), Caesar, Cassius, *Cato, Cicero, Cleopatra, Cornelia, Curio, Julia, Marcia, (Plautus), (Sextus), (Terence).

3. Empire (10): *Horace, (Juvenal), Livy, *Lucan, (Lucius Varius), *Ovid, (Persius), Seneca, *Statius, *Virgil.

D. 100-600 A.D. (23): (Pope Anastasius), (Attila), ST. AUGUSTINE, *ST. BENEDICT, BOETHIUS, (CALIXTUS I), EMPEROR CONSTANTINE, DONATUS, Galen, (POPE GREGORY I [ST. GREGORY]), ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *EMPEROR JUSTINIAN, LUCIA, ST. MACARIUS, (Modred), PAULUS OROSIUS, (PIUS I), (Priscian), Ptolemy, (SIXTUS I), EMPEROR TRAJAN, Tristan, (URBAN I).

E. 600-1100 A.D. (18): ALI, ST. ANSELM, Avicenna, BEDE, (MOTHER OF CACCIAGUIDA), CHARLEMAGNE, (Ganelon), GODFREY OF BOUILLON, *Hugh Capet, ST. ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, *Mahomet, *ST. PETER DAMIAN, RABANUS MAURUS, RENOART, ROBERT GUISCARD, ROLAND, ST. ROMUALDUS, WILLIAM OF ORANGE.

F. Twelfth Century (17):

I. Italian (8): (Alighiero), *CACCIAGUIDA, CONSTANCE, GRATIAN, JOACHIM OF FLORA, PETER LOMBARD, *Abbot of San Zeno, WILLIAM II OF SICILY.

¹ As Dante evidently took this reference (*Purg.* XXII, 114) direct from Statius (giving more of the incident in *Inf.* XXVI, 62, and *Purg.* IX, 34-39, as told by that poet), and Statius does not tell how many sisters there were, Dante probably had no definite number in mind. Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, I, 6, pictures a frieze on a Vatican sarcophagus in which five sisters appear. I have been unable to find any text that justifies this number, however, and have counted the sisters as two.

- II. Non-Italian (9): **Arnault Daniel*, Averrhoës, **St. Bernard*, **Bertran de Born*, *Henry III of England*, *HUGH OF ST. VICTOR*, *PETRUS COMESTOR*, *RICHARD OF ST. VICTOR*, *Saladin*.

G. Thirteenth Century (122):

I. Italian (103):

1. 1200-1275 (46):

- a) Lombardy (3): Buoso da Duera, **Sordello*, Tesauero di Beccheria.
- b) Venetia (3): Azzolino, **CUNIZZA*, *Jacomo da Sant' Andrea*.
- c) Emilia (8): Asdente, **Catalano*, (*Francesco d'Accorso*), **Guido del Duca*, **Guido Guinizelli*, **Loderingo*, (*Ottaviano degli Ubaldini*), **Rinier da Calboto*.
- d) Tuscany (22): Alessandro degli Alberti, (*Arrigo*), **Bocca degli Abati*, **Brunetto Latini*, **Cavalcante de' Cavalcanti*, **Corrado Malaspina*, **Farinata*, (*Focaccia de' Cancellieri*), (*Geri del Bello*), (*Gianni de' Soldanieri*), **Griffolino*, **Guido Guerra*, **Jacopo Rusticucci*, **Mosca de' Lamberti*, *Napoleone degli Alberti*, **Omberto Aldobrandeschi*, *Provenzan Salvani*, *Puccio Sciancato*, (*Rinier Pazzo*), **Sapia*, **Tegghiaio Aldobrandi*, *Ubaldo dalla Pila*.
- e) Umbria (3): (*St. Clare*), *St. Francis*, *ILLUMINATO*.
- f) Latium (2): **St. BONAVENTURA*, **Pope Nicholas III*.
- g) Campania (3): *AGOSTINO*, **Pier delle Vigne*, **St. Thomas AQUINAS*.
- h) Sicily (2): (*Emperor Frederick II*), **Manfred*.

2. 1275-1300 (57):

- a) Piedmont (1): *Marquis William of Montferrat*.
- b) Liguria (1): **Pope Adrian V*.
- c) Lombardy (2): **Maestro Adamo*, **Marco Lombardo*.
- d) Venetia (1): **One of the Scrovigni*.
- e) Emilia (9): *Bonifazio de' Fieschi*, **Francesca da Rimini*, *Guido Bonatti*, *Messer Marchese*, *Obizzo da Este*, *Paolo Malatesta*, **Pier da Medicina*, (*Tebaldello*), **Venedico Caccianimico*.
- f) Tuscany (35): *Agnello*, **Alessio Interminei*, (*Andrea di Mozzi*), **BEATRICE*, **Belacqua*, *Benincasa di Laterina*, **Bonagiunta*, Buoso, **Camicion de' Pazzi*, **Capocchio*, **Casella*, **Ciaccio*, *Cianfa Donati*, *Federigo Novello*, **Filippo Argenti*, **Forese Donati*, *One of the Gianfigliuzzi*, *Gianni Schicchi*, *Giovanni da Pisa*, *Guccio Tarlati*, *Guercio de' Cavalcanti*, *Guglielmo Borsiere*, (*Guido da Romena*), *Lano*, **La Pia*, **Lotto degli Agli*, **Matilda*, *Orso degli Alberti*,

*PICCARDA, (Rinier da Corneto), Archbishop Ruggieri, Sassol Mascheroni, One of the Ubriachi, *Ugolino, *Vanni Fucci.

g) Marches (3): *Buonconte da Montefeltro, *Guido da Montefeltro, *Jacopo del Cassero.

h) Umbria (1): *Oderisi d' Agobbio.

i) Abruzzi (1): Pope Celestine V.

j) Sardinia (3): (Fra Gomita), (Michel Zanche), *Nino de' Visconti.

II. Non-Italian (19):

1. Belgium, France, Navarre (9): *Charles I of Anjou*, *Ciampolo di Navarra, *FOLQUET DE MARSELHA, *Henry of Navarre*, *Pope Martin IV*, *Philip III of France*, *Pierre de La Brosse*, (ROMEO), SIER OF BRABANT.

2. Spain (4): *Alfonso III of Aragon*, (St. DOMINIC¹), POPE JOHN XXI [PETER OF SPAIN], *Peter III of Aragon*.

3. England, Scotland (2): Guy of Montfort, Michael Scot.

4. Austria, Bohemia, Hungary (4): ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *CHARLES MARTEL, *Ottocar of Bohemia*, *Emperor Rudolph of Hapsburg*.

H. Fourteenth Century (15):

I. Italian (13):

1. Venetia (1): (Vitaliano).

2. Liguria (2): Branca d'Oria, (Relative of Branca d'Oria).

3. Emilia (2): *Alberigo de' Manfredi, (Gian Ciotto).

4. Tuscany (7): (Alessandro da Romena), (Brother of Alessandro da Romena), (Bonturo), (Carlino de' Pazzi), (Corso Donati), *Dante² (Gianni Buiamonte).

5. Latium (1): (Pope Boniface VIII).

II. Non-Italian (2):

1. France (1): (Pope Clement V).

2. Germany (1): (EMPEROR HENRY VII).

A glance through the list shows the tremendous range of the poet's dramatic vision. He draws his characters from legend and from history, from early times down through every century of the Christian era; from Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Among the historical characters twenty centuries are represented, and sixteen of the nations of Europe, as well as some minor countries

¹ In *Par. XII*, 31-105, St. Bonaventura tells St. Dominic's story in such a way that there can be no possible doubt of Dante's intention to assign him to Paradise.

² Since Dante must pass through Purgatory before attaining Paradise, and since he refers to his future participation in the punishments there, he is assigned to Purgatory (see below, p. 378).

in Asia and Africa. There follow examples from every century and from the European nations:

Sixth century B.C., Thales; fifth, Socrates; fourth, Aristotle; third, Epicurus; second, Zeno; first, Lucius Junius Brutus; first A.D., Statius; second, Galen; third, Lucia; fourth, St. John Chrysostom; fifth, Pope Anastasius; sixth, St. Benedict; seventh, St. Isidore; eighth, Bede; ninth, Charlemagne; tenth, Hugh Capet; eleventh, St. Anselm; twelfth, Arnault Daniel; thirteenth, St. Francis; fourteenth, Henry VII.

Greece, Homer; Rome, Caesar; England, Guy of Montfort; Scotland, Richard of St. Victor; France, St. Bernard; Belgium, Godfrey of Bouillon; Provence, Bertran de Born; Navarre, Ciampolo; Spain, Paulus Orosius; Italy, Farinata; Germany, Rabanus Maurus; Austria, Rudolph of Hapsburg; Hungary, Albertus Magnus; Bohemia, Ottocar.

The same breadth of range appears in the selection of spirits in many of the special groups. In the second circle of the Inferno, though only nine of the great lovers are named, they are taken from Egypt, Assyria, Greece, Rome, Troy, the Arthurian Cycle, and modern Italy. In the first *girone* of the seventh circle are persons from Africa of the first century, third- and fourth-century Greeks, a fifth-century Hun, modern Italians, and a modern Englishman. The ninth *bolgia* holds representatives from the third century B.C. in Rome, the seventh century in Arabia, the twelfth century in Provence, and modern Italy. In the Vale of Princes are rulers from Italy, France, England, Spain, and Austria. The three men recognized on the fifth terrace of Purgatory are taken from the first century in Rome, the tenth century in France, and modern Italy. In the Heaven of Mars the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the *Chansons de geste*, and the eleventh century in Belgium and Italy are represented.

Modern Italians (i.e., from the twelfth to the fourteenth century) are found in every one of the main subdivisions (Circles, Terraces, Heavens, etc.) in which souls are recognized, with the exception of Limbus, the Shore of the Island, and the Heavens of Mercury, Saturn, and the Fixed Stars.

Nearly one-third of all the people in the *Divine Comedy* were active just preceding or during Dante's lifetime. With all his knowledge of history and legend he was constantly alive to the world of literature and politics of his own day and country. He takes people

from all but three (Apulia, Basilicata, and Calabria) of the main provinces of Italy and from all of the important cities. By far the largest representation is, as is natural, from Tuscany.

That the largest part in the *Divine Comedy* is played by modern Italians is emphasized by the fact that of the 81 persons who hold converse with Dante during the whole journey, 55 are of this group. Of the other 26, 3 are Old Testament characters, 3 from the New Testament, 3 Greeks, 6 Romans, 2 from 100 to 600 A.D., 3 from 600 to 1100 A.D., and for the period after 1100, 3 Provençals, 1 Frenchman, 1 Navarrese, and 1 Hungarian.

Many varying devices are used in the identification of the characters. Of the 243 spirits whom Dante sees, 55 are not named. They are identified by descriptions of their appearance: Charles I of Anjou is "colui dal maschio naso," Henry of Navarre is distinguished by his "benigno aspetto"; by brief autobiographies: Francesca, Pier delle Vigne, Charles Martel; by their family arms: one member each of the Gianfigliazzi, Ubriachi, and Scrovigni families; by their relatives, home, or both; Cavalcante de' Cavalcanti is known by Dante's words, "Guido vostro," the naming of the Bisenzio valley and their father denotes the Alberti brothers; by brief phrases denoting some outstanding quality or fact: "colui Che fece per viltà il gran rifiuto," "il maestro di color che sanno," "colei che s'ancise amorosa E ruppe fede al cener di Sicheo."

Dante himself recognizes 66 spirits by face, by voice, or merely by the place or condition in which he finds them. Virgil identifies 34 spirits; Beatrice, strangely enough, only 4 (James, John, Adam, and Mary); and St. Bernard, 13. The guardian Nessus identifies 5 spirits; 78 spirits are identified by their companions, 9 of these by Sordello and 6 by the Eagle, while 43 spirits identify themselves.

Of all the individual human *dramatis personae* 186 are in Hell, 47 in Purgatory, and 99 in Paradise. By no means all of these souls are introduced in the account of the division in which they are located. In some cases their location is referred to, definitely or indefinitely, before the place in question is reached, and is confirmed by sight in that place. Thus in *Inf.* IV Virgil mentions Adam, Moses, David, and Rachel as taken to Heaven at the time of the Harrowing of Hell, and Dante sees them in Paradise. In *Inf.* VI he hears of Farinata,

Tegghiaio, Jacopo Rusticucci, and Mosca, whom he later finds "tra le anime più nere." Piccarda's appearance in Paradise is prepared for in *Purg.* XXIV. In like manner are prophesied the appearances of the two Johns, Mary, St. Francis, and Peter.

In other cases the location of a soul is referred to *before* the place in question is reached, and is *not* confirmed thereafter. Instances of this are: Abel, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Isaac, Twelve Sons of Jacob, Arrigo, St. Clare, Samuel, St. Dominic, Mother of Cacciaguida, Sixtus I, Pius I, Calixtus I, Urban I, Paul, St. Gregory.

In still other cases the presence of a soul in a given location is not mentioned until after the account of that location is passed. Instances of this are: Geri del Bello, the twenty Greeks and Romans named in *Purg.* XXII, and Alighiero. Manto, though referred to by Virgil in *Purg.* XXII, 13, as dwelling in Limbus, by a strange inconsistency appears also in the fourth *bolgia* of the eighth circle.

In Limbus are more *dramatis personae* than in any other one secondary division in the *Commedia*, and more than in the whole of Purgatory. Dante sees there 40 spirits, and later (*Purg.* XXII, see above) he locates there 20 more. In the Fourth Heaven we find the second largest single group in the *Divine Comedy*, the so-called twenty-four theologians. (Donatus is the only one of the group whose work is not theological in character.) In these two groups Dante finds the majority of the men whose works were his most important sources.

Of all the persons listed, 243 are seen by Dante; 81 of these speak with him. The remaining 88 (excluding Dante and including Manto) do not appear at all, but are mentioned as belonging to one of the three main divisions, and in the majority of cases are assigned to definite places. Of these 88 spirits, 50 are mentioned out of place (see above) and 11 are located by prophecy as in the case of Henry VII (see below, p. 378). Of the remaining 27, 14 are named by companion spirits—as when Farinata locates "lo secondo Federico E il Cardinale"; 5 by Virgil; 5 by the demon Nessus; 2, Simon Magus and Briareus, by Dante himself; and 1, Anastasius, by the inscription on his tomb.

Of all the characters of the *Divine Comedy*, 15 are given definite places in eternity, although they were still alive in 1300. Of these,

Dante prophetically assigns 13 to Hell. The first, Gian Ciotto, Francesca refers to with the words, "Caïna attende chi vita ci spense" (*Inf.* V, 107). The second and third, Vitaliano and Gianni Buiamonte, have their coming anticipated by the bearer of the Scrovigni arms (*Inf.* XVII, 68 ff.). The popes Boniface VIII and Clement V are located by Nicholas III, who first mistakes Dante for Boniface, and later calls Clement "un pastor senza legge," who will be buried in the same rock with his predecessor (*Inf.* XIX, 52 ff.). The sixth man, Bonturo, one of the Malebranche designates by the ironical remark (*Inf.* XXI, 39-41):

. . . . io torno per anche
A quella terra ch'i'n'ho ben fornita:
Ognun v'è barattier, fuor che Bonturo.

Maestro Adamo locates the two da Romena brothers by longing for their participation in the same punishment he is enduring (*Inf.* XXX, 76 ff.). The ninth man, Carlino de' Pazzi, is eagerly awaited by his kinsman Camicione, that the greater sinner may make the lesser seem innocent by comparison (*Inf.* XXXII, 69 ff.). In Tolomea three souls actually appear in Hell while their bodies are still moving about on earth—the traitors Alberigo de' Manfredi, Branca d' Oria, and "un suo prossimano." The death and damnation of the thirteenth man, Corso Donati, are foretold in Purgatory by his brother Forese (*Purg.* XXIV, 82 ff.). To the fourteenth man, Henry VII, a seat is assigned in Paradise in a prophecy uttered by Beatrice in the Empyrean.

The last man of the group is Dante himself. His ultimate salvation is foretold in several passages of the *Divine Comedy*, as follows:

. . . . Per altra via, per altri porti
Verrai a piaggia, non qui, per passare;
Più lieve legno convien che ti porti (*Inf.* III, 91-93).

. . . . per tornare altra volta
. . . . fo io questo viaggio (*Purg.* II, 91, 92).

. . . . sono in prima vita,
Ancor che l'altra sì andando acquisti (*Purg.* VIII, 59, 60).

Gli occhi mi fieno ancor qui tolti (*Purg.* XIII, 133).

Quinci su vo per non esser più cieco (*Purg.* XXVI, 58).

Beato te, che delle nostre marche . . .
Per morir meglio esperienza imbarche! (*Purg.* XXVI, 73, 75.)

E sarai meco senza fine cive
Di quella Roma onde Cristo è Romano (*Purg.* XXXII, 101, 102).

. . . *sicut tibi, cui*
Bis unquam coeli ianua reclusa? (*Par.* XV, 29, 30.)

Qui vedrai l'una e l'altra milizia
Di Paradiso, e l'una in quegli aspetti
Che tu vedrai all'ultima giustizia (*Par.* XXX, 43-45).

Prima che tu a queste nozze ceni (*Par.* XXX, 135).

Of the thirteen men prophetically assigned to Hell the majority died before or during the writing of the *Commedia*. There is uncertainty as to the dates of the deaths of Vitaliano, Carlino de' Pazzi, and Alberigo de' Manfredi. Alessandro da Romena was alive in 1316, and the brother mentioned in *Inf.* XXX, 77, Scartazzini says, was Aghinolfo, who was still alive in 1338. He also tells us that in 1325 there was living in Florence a Giovanni Buiamonte, who may have been the "cavalier sovrano" (*Inf.* XVII, 72). That Branca d'Oria was alive for several years after Dante's death there seems to be no doubt.

Of the nine popes among the dramatis personae, two (John XXI and Gregory I) have attained Paradise, two (Adrian V and Martin IV) are working out their salvation in Purgatory, and five (Celestine V, Anastasius, Nicholas III, Boniface VIII, and Clement V) are in Hell.

Of the seven emperors, Frederick II is in Hell, Rudolph of Hapsburg is in Purgatory, and Justinian, Charlemagne, Trajan, Constantine, and Henry VII are in Paradise.

Four members of Dante's family are referred to. His great-great-grandmother is assigned to Paradise by Cacciaguida with the words, "mia madre, ch'è or santa" (*Par.* XVI, 35). Cacciaguida himself is the only one of the group whom Dante actually sees. He tells of his son, Alighiero, the first man to bear the name, and the

great-grandfather of the poet. He has been wandering about "cent' anni e più" on the first terrace of Purgatory bearing the burden of the proud. Geri del Bello, schismatic and murderer, a cousin of Dante's father, is in the ninth *bolgia*.

There are nine personal friends of Dante, with all of whom he holds converse. Only the first he places in Hell. These are: Brunetto Latini, Belacqua, Nino de' Visconti, Forese Donati, Casella, Matilda, Piccarda, Charles Martel, Beatrice.

There are 82 men of letters among the *dramatis personae*, making about 25 per cent of the whole. Ten of these lived in Dante's time. He talks with nine of them and with sixteen of the older writers.

There are only 45 women in the list, and of these the seven who speak to Dante are thirteenth-century Italians. Though there is a small part as far as numbers are concerned, they do in a sense lend color to the whole *Divine Comedy*. In the opening scenes of the *Inferno* the influence of Mary, Lucia, and Beatrice is strongly felt, though they do not appear in person. The story of Francesca da Rimini is the most familiar episode in the poem. In the words of La Pia, brief as they are, is condensed the tragedy of a whole life. With the pageant in the Earthly Paradise appears Beatrice herself, and thereafter the poem is dominated by her presence. For her Dante has written

Quello che mai non fu detto d'alcuna.

DOROTHY LISTER SIMONS

CHICAGO, ILL.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

SOME WAR NOVELS WITH SOLDIERS AS HEROES

Three books stand out decidedly as the best attempts to depict types of the soldier of the Great War. The material is practically all borrowed from reality; art, however, is allowed to play a part in the grouping of events, in the selection of characteristic traits, occasionally in the focusing of such traits as will render the picture clearer to the reader.

One is René Benjamin's *Gaspard*, the first to come out (1915). This book will hold its own, not only against the other more recent war books, but even after the war. *Gaspard* will remain a type in French literature, such, let us say, as Molière's Scapin, Daudet's Tartarin, Hugo's Gavroche, or Aicard's Maurin des Maures. Indeed the name *Gaspard* has already passed into the language to designate the intelligent, alert man of the people of France, or rather of Paris, the man of perfectly unsophisticated brain, who has a genius for acting kindly, is always ready to help, is doing, without seeming to think of it at all, the most beautiful things; picturesque in speech, droll in manner, sound in mind as a red apple, transparent as glass, true as steel. This is the French soldier which the general public, especially abroad, likes to imagine—and perfectly legitimately; *Gaspards* are more likely to be found in the French army than elsewhere, although nobody would think that all are *Gaspards* in the French army.¹

The second book is *Bourru, soldat de Vauquois* (1916) by Jean des Vignes Rouges. It corresponds to the second period of the war, when the hell of the trenches rendered the life of the soldier much harder and stripped war of much of the *heroï-romanesque* which would otherwise, to some extent, extenuate its horrors. Of course, in *Gaspard* we had not really much of war itself; we had the mobilization period, and just two episodes on the front; after the first, the wounding, nursing, and convalescence of *Gaspard*; after the second, his return home as a cripple. *Gaspard* was still a civilian, accidentally mixed up with the war, who had kept in the army his attitude of everyday life. For *Bourru*, civilian life is a dear remembrance only, he has become a soldier through and through, and very few pages of the book are not pictures of war, and war of the fiercest sort and at one of the worst spots on the whole battle line. *Bourru*—who, besides, is not a witty shopkeeper of Montmartre in Paris, but a peasant from Burgundy, with the qualities of his race, intelligent, energetic, quiet—has not the cheerfulness of *Gaspard*;

¹ René Benjamin has published a second book, *Sous le ciel de France*, and very recently another novel *Le Major Pipe et son père* (Fayard, 1918), the story of a newspaper man who at first dislikes the British heartily but later grows enthusiastically fond of them.

he is *bourru* ("a grumbler"), but as a soldier he is just as brave and good as Gaspard; and perhaps because he has not that cheerfulness to help him out in his trials he is the more admirable in his behavior. Although not as entertaining as Gaspard, he represents probably more truly the average fine soldier of France.¹

The third book is Barbusse's *Le Feu*. It pictures the soldiers in the trenches when the third year of war was in sight. If the soldier could still be courageous in facing grim reality, nobody could expect of him, nobody would accept as genuine, the everlasting cheerfulness of Gaspard; even to expect the grumbling good-naturedness of Bourru would be expecting a great deal. And indeed *Le Feu* is most depressing and at the same time has what people call the most realistic descriptions of trench warfare.

Le Feu is easily the most-discussed book of the war. And for the writer of literary history in the future it will be well to keep in mind the following data. Of course a work is never read and judged entirely from the point of view of its artistic value. We need only recall famous examples such as *la querelle du Cid*, in which the personal jealousies of Scudéri and Richelieu played an essential part; such as the personal episode which gave to human art Musset's *Les Nuits* and *Le Souvenir* and presupposes the knowledge of the controversy of *Elle et Lui* and *Lui et Elle*; or again such as Maupassant's famous story *Le Horla*, which must be explained by the family antecedents of the *nouvelliste*. *Le Feu* is a new and remarkable example of this.

What aroused so much comment about *Le Feu*—praise on the one hand and criticism on the other—is the tone of the book, which appears to many to be not only realistic (which would be legitimate) but in part plainly cynical. There are those who see in so brutal a picture a sane, even a necessary reaction against the silly optimism prevailing in many quarters. The stupid pictures which represented the French soldiers as enjoying life thoroughly in the trenches—as if every one of them was eager for nothing but to die for his country, as if he charged the enemy always in a state of sublime exaltation, and when lying wounded in the hospital had but one thought only, to return as soon as possible to sacrifice whatever limb was left to him—seemed to them absurd, unjust, and immoral. Thus Barbusse, they would argue, was fully justified even in overdrawing the picture in order to stop such misconceptions.

But there are those on the other hand who lay stress on another phase of the problem. The book came out, they remark, just at the darkest period of the war, when France was finding it so hard to keep up the spirits of her children in the terrific struggle. It was therefore very wrong, in such an hour, to speak words of discouragement. To tell the truth to a sick man when the truth may kill him, while mere abstention from saying anything may allow him to pull through, is not right.

¹ Some very interesting information is given in the book about the underground warfare carried on by the sappers and miners (for which topic see also *La Guerre souterraine* by Captain Danrit). Two other books have come out (1917) by J. des Vignes Rouges, *L'Âme des chefs*, and a novel, *André Rieu, officier de France*.

Moreover the charge was brought against Barbusse that the book was realistic in the sense of "shocking," but not realistic in the sense of "true." An army composed of such men as described in *Le Feu* could not have achieved what the French army *did* achieve; again the men in the squad are all non-thinking men who cannot realize the meaning of the struggle (see, for example, Maclair, in the *Semaine littéraire*). French officers and soldiers, it might be stated, have repeatedly protested, and they are in a position to know as well as Barbusse; they have sometimes pronounced the book "criminal" (one example of such protest appeared in the *New York Times*).¹

We have just recalled the part of a famous minister, Richelieu, in a famous literary *querelle*; here also the historian of the future will have to examine the possible part of a minister in the *querelle du Feu*. No secret is made, especially in the last pages of the book under consideration, of the author's disbelief in the idea of *patrie*. The question then arose: How is it that books much less outspoken on much less paramount issues should have been pitilessly censured while *Le Feu* was not? And how is it that this book belittling patriotism should be allowed to come out just at the time when these very ideas were used by German propaganda trying desperately to create a demand for peace in France? A plausible answer was made repeatedly and openly: because the minister of the interior was then Malvy, who was later charged with treason; Malvy allowed the book to pass (see the article in the *New York Times* already mentioned). On this special point a careful reading of the book may to a certain extent absolve Barbusse; while, theoretically, Barbusse is opposed to purely national pursuits and advocates human ideals, yet in this concrete case of the Great War he believes that France is waging a just fight. In other words, unless new arguments are brought forward, one can only make this statement, that German propagandists may have used the book of Barbusse in a way of which he himself may have disapproved. As far as the writer knows, Barbusse never took the trouble to answer the critics. This may be pride.²

The historian of literature of the future will have to take into consideration another point when he wishes to explain the *cas Barbusse*. Surely the author was led by temperament to the morbid attitude he assumed toward

¹ Here are the words of a man who has won great esteem among American scholars, Lucien Foulet: "The book contains some good, some bad; without entering into any detail I will tell you that as far as the life of the trenches is concerned, it is in no way a faithful rendering. I have passed twenty-one months in the trenches and I know what it is. As for the language of the 'poilu,' he idealises it from certain points of view, and renders it extraordinarily vulgar at times." (From a private letter).

² Concerning the success of the book in America the situation is about the same as in France, namely, that it is quite possible that German agents helped in advertising *Le Feu*; but *Under Fire* was published by a firm (Dutton) which has shown strong pro-Ally tendencies and therefore could be accused only of imprudence. It was an unfortunate fact that the translation came out just at the time when American public opinion had to decide whether or not America should enter the war; it did not, however, stem the tide.

the soldier. Barbusse is the man who, some years before *Le Feu*, had written *L'Enfer*, which is about the most impure and morbid book any man may wish to handle. There are many ways of expressing despairing and disgusted views of life; the literature of all ages shows this, from Buddha and Khayyam to Leopardi, Schopenhauer, and Baudelaire. Why did Barbusse choose the most repulsive? It seems quite natural that a man so disposed should, once the war had, so to speak, forced upon him the heroes of the trenches, write about them as he had written about the disgusting (even if perhaps real) creatures he had described before, namely in an abnormal, insane fashion.

The writer would go even farther. Surely a large part of the regrettable popularity of *Le Feu*, in France as in this country, rests with the public. It is partly an effect of the modern craze for the sensational, the abnormal, and the morbid. You think naturally of a woman as a charming, graceful, kind creature, and you consider it the duty of "real," "true," "original" art, so to speak, to represent her as wilful, masculine, and cruel. Your normal idea of a clergyman is that of a conventional, sincere, and honest man, but he becomes "artistically" interesting only when he is represented unconventional, shrewd, satanic. And so the picture of a soldier which comes first to your mind is that of a vigorous, fine, heroic fellow, but a book representing him as shockingly non-heroic, homesick, and avoiding hardships ought to be then the soldier of the "original, superior artist"; it would be terribly bourgeois not to accept this distressing picture, and this is a good chance for one who feels the soul of a Philistine within himself to make the world believe that he is none himself.

Those who seek in war literature strong sensation because they think that the terrible and the sickening are inseparable from this literature need not read *Le Feu*, which leaves behind a distinctly bad smell. There are only too many others to suggest. As we have mentioned novels only, we shall do no more than give a few titles in addition to *Bourru, soldat de Vauquois*, already mentioned, namely, Lieutenant Péricard, *Ceux de Verdun*; Diéterlan, *Le Bois, le Prêtre*; Le Bail, *La Brigade des Jean Gouin*; Louis Thomas, *Les Diables bleus pendant la Guerre de Délivrance, 1914-1916*; Ch. Le Goffic, *Dixmude, un chapitre de l'histoire des fusiliers marins, 7 oct. au 10 nov. 1914*; H. Bordeaux, *Les derniers jours du Fort de Vaux and Prisonniers délivrés*.

A place by itself must be given to Marcel Berger, *Le Miracle du feu* (1916). There is a delicate love affair interwoven in the account of the first weeks of the war, but the main thing is a piece of very keen psychological analysis of a soldier's mind. But while Gaspard, Bourru de Vauquois, and the man of the squad of *Le Feu* are soldiers sprung from the plain people of France, Berger's soldier, a sergeant, belongs to the class of the intellectuals who, before the war, still adopted a skeptical, even cynical, view of things. Michel has a good position and need not exert himself, thus he leads a comfortable, uneventful, and self-centered life; he has banished emotion from

his existence as a disturbing element; he does not marry because of the burden that would be imposed upon him. When the war breaks out he joins his regiment reluctantly and because not doing so would be likely to cause him much more trouble than to do his duty; once in the army he is very anxious to avoid all unnecessary labor; he is friendly to his soldiers, and that is all. Gradually, however, he comes to realize that the plain man of the people is morally fully the equal, often the superior, of the man with the cultivated mind. He cannot help noticing and enjoying the beauty of human brotherhood as it is manifested in the war. He has a relapse into pessimism when left to his thoughts in the hospital, while recovering from a serious wound, but with the return of health a lofty optimism and faith in human nature finally win. If such a book does not appeal to the general public, as do the others mentioned, it is fully equal to any of them in keenness and conscientious workmanship.

SMITH COLLEGE

ALBERT SCHINZ

The Life of Lazarillo de Tormes and His Fortunes and Adversities.

Done out of the Castilian from R. Foulché-Delbosc's restitution of the *Editio Princeps* by LOUIS HOW with an Introduction and Notes by CHARLES PHILIP WAGNER. New York: Mitchell Kinnerley, 1917.

This book is an important contribution to *Lazarillo* studies. Mr. How's translation is far superior to any previous rendering of this text into English. It will supersede the versions of Rowland, Blakeston, Roscoe, and Sir Clements Markham. It is more accurate than any of these and no whit inferior in readableness and literary distinction. Professor Wagner has assembled in his introduction and notes all the important results of previous scholars, together with many valuable, original suggestions of his own.

Mr. How wisely chose as the basis for his translation Foulché-Delbosc's composite text, thereby avoiding the mistakes of Cejador and Bonilla, who in their recent texts of the *Lazarillo* attach undue importance to the Burgos and Antwerp texts respectively. Good as the translation is, it is not infallible. I suggest the following possible betterments. Page 5: Add the words "who went thither" after "knight." Page 7: Omission of the phrase *hazia perdidas*. Translate: "and he made away with the rugs and horse blankets." *Casa*, "house," means "religious establishment" in this context. Page 12: How translates *no me demediaua de lo necessario*: "didn't share even the necessities with me." Better: "didn't give me half what I needed." Page 13: The difficult phrase *tan por contadero* is too freely rendered, "so well counted." Page 15: *Capuz* means here "gown" rather than "hood." Page 20: "Towns" rather than "places." "Would move away" is too weak. I suggest, "would take French leave." *Para echarlo*

en el fardel tornauase mosto, y lo que a el se llegaua is wrongly rendered, "if put into the sack, it would turn to must, and so we decided on this," etc. The last phrase is a complete misunderstanding. Better, "if put into the sack, it and whatever came close to it would turn to must." Page 24: "That I had to enjoy myself with." Read: "that I was to enjoy." Page 25: *Hallose en frio* does not mean, "he found himself chilled," but corresponds rather to the modern *estar* or *quedarse fresco*. The translator has sacrificed accuracy to maintain the pun. We might say in slang, "He found that he had received a cold deal in the form of the cold turnip." Page 26: Add "and substitution" after "exchange." "Wretched" rather than "black sausage." *Golosina* here means "tidbit" rather than "gluttony"; it refers literally to the sausage. Page 27: "That it abandoned its stolen goods." Better: "that the stolen goods hit it," i.e., the blind man's nose. Page 28: *Con* should be rendered "although" instead of "because." *Demanda* is a legal term and means "accusation" rather than "requests." Page 29: *Hombre* means "one," "anybody," not "man." Page 36: "Because I had nowhere to make him jump." Wrong. Better: "Because I had no means of attacking him." Page 37: "From him" instead of "from it." Page 38: "However it might be most to his service." Better: "However he might be most pleased." Page 41: "Miserly" rather than "miserable." Page 42: Omit "come." Page 45: "Are we placed by being born?" Read: "Are we mortals placed?" Translate *passar* by "suffer" or "endure" rather than by "change." Page 47: "Wretched" for "darksome." "Rendered keen" rather than "animated." Page 50: *Contino el gato estaua armado dentro del arca*, "the cat was continually on watch inside the chest." Read: "Straightway the trap was set inside the chest." Page 51: "Gown" rather than "clothes." Page 52: *Trasgo*, "goblin" rather than "ghost." Page 53: *Muy a menudo*, "frequently" rather than "very minute." Farther on an omission. Read: "so that my startled master heard it." Page 54: *Contaua el que se auia llegado a mi*, "he used to relate that he had come to me." This should be rendered: "he calculated that he had come up to me." Page 55: *He caçado* does not mean "I have been hunting," but means "I have caught." Page 56: *Con todo esto* means "nevertheless" not "meanwhile." *Demediar* means not "help" but "give (me) half enough." Page 58: *Andando assi discurriendo de puerta en puerta*, "I was wandering thus aimlessly from door to door." Better: "Thus reasoning as I walked from door to door." The meaning of *discurriendo* is determined by what precedes. Page 60: *Manga* means in this context "pouch" or "bag" not "sleeve." Page 61: "Fit for the public ear" not "appropriate." Page 63: "Those I had got in God's name." Better: "those I had got by begging." Page 66: "But now we shall have to do otherwise." Omit "have to." Page 69: "And he went down the street." Change "down" to "up." Why not follow Morel-Fatio's suggestion and change "Count of Arcos" to "Count of Claros"? Foulché-Delbosc does not do so, neither do Cejador and Bonilla, but the

point has been fully proved. Page 70: "Where I saw." Insert "in a garden" after "where." Page 79: *Pan* here has the old meaning "wheat" rather than "bread." Page 82: *A desora* is "suddenly," "unexpectedly," rather than "in an evil hour." Page 89: *Todavía passa su lazeria*, "then his indigence passes." Better: "he still suffers indigence." "To laugh at his pleasantries," etc. Throughout this passage the translator fails to recognize the divided conditional. Page 90: "To tell some trifles." Rather: "to give a few sharp spur-pricks." "Amusing things." Better: "accomplishments." Page 94: "For the love of God." Better: "For the sake of Charity." Page 96: "Monastery" rather than "convent." Page 103: *De su estado*, "full length" rather than "from his footing." Page 110: "To the scrivener and to the members of the council." Read: "to his scrivener and that of the council." Page 112: Read: "ten captives" instead of "two captives." Page 116: "I also underwent sufferings." Read: "I also underwent a tolerable number of sufferings." Page 122: Change "because" to "that." Much that I have here considered wrong may be due to a certain freedom which the translator has felt justified in employing for the sake of style. If I call attention to errors it is solely to make more useful his very serviceable book.

Mr. Wagner's contribution to the volume is even better. He gives us the best succinct summing up of the *Lazarillo* problems anywhere available and evinces unusual thoroughness and sagacity. The only important bibliographical omission is his failure to use Bonilla y San Martín's edition (Madrid, 1915). It appeared two years before Wagner's study, but possibly this was finished before the Bonilla edition became available. In his discussion of the dating of the *Lazarillo*, Wagner's argument seems more plausible than Bonilla's. And he has done far more than any of his predecessors toward reconstructing the folklore background underlying the first of the great picaresque novels. His merit is to have studied the *Lazarillo* from a European rather than from a narrowly Spanish viewpoint. As an example of Wagner's acuteness see page xxiii and note, where he proves that the allusion to the *Lazarillo* in Cristóbal de Villalón's *Crotalón* refers to the underlying folklore original, not to the anonymous *Segunda Parte*, as De Haan and Bonilla had supposed. He is less discerning, I think, when he follows authority in considering the unique passages of the Alcalá edition to be late interpolations. Did not these passages too belong to the lost original? See page 24 of the present work, immediately after the first long "interpolation," where the author of the *Lazarillo* writes: "But not to be prolix, I omit an account of many things, as funny as they are worthy of note, which befel me with this my first master," etc. In mediaeval and Renaissance manuscripts omissions from, and condensations of, the source are frequently indicated by such remarks as this. Furthermore the author of the alleged interpolation has also condensed his source. Further adventures at the inn with the "eating-house women and nougat-sellers, and prostitutes, and such

women-folk" are plainly promised but not supplied. There is also evident condensation in the short chapters toward the end. Some few at least of the "thousand ills" suffered in the service of the tambourine painter must have been described in the lost source. Otherwise it is difficult to account for the introduction of this personage.

Wagner has found no less than seven European versions of the "smell-the-post" story and promises an article on the subject. I prefer the term "the blind man's leap" rather than the former, because it does not seem to me that the post necessarily figures in the trick. Everybody is familiar with the quotation from *Much Ado about Nothing* in which Shakespeare betrays familiarity with the story. But so far as I know, no commentator, either upon Shakespeare or the *Lazarillo*, has ever pointed out the possible connection between the leap of Gloucester (*King Lear*, Act IV, scene vi) and that of the blind beggar in the *Lazarillo*. As early as 1754 a Mrs. Lennox indicated as the source of the Gloucester-Edgar-Edmund story *The Paphlagonian Unkind King*, an episodic story introduced by Sir Philip Sidney into Book II of his *Arcadia*. But in this story Shakespeare found only a suggestion for the trick played upon the blind man by his guide. The king, wishing to commit suicide, asks his guide to lead him to the top of a high rock. This, Leonatus, the dutiful son, simply refuses to do. Now Shakespeare, on reading the *Arcadia*, was struck by the resemblance between the fate of the Paphlagonian king and that of King Lear. Both had been betrayed by favorite children, and each was aided in his distress by a child previously treated with injustice and cruelty. Therefore he wove these two very similar stories into one. Is it not possible that the situation of the blind man and his guide, figuring in Sidney's tale, similarly suggested to Shakespeare the story of *Lazarillo* and his blind master? He may easily have read the Rowland translation of 1576; and if not directly familiar with the *Lazarillo* he at least knew some other version of "the blind man's leap" story, as the allusion in *Much Ado about Nothing* clearly proves: "Ho! now you strike like the blind man; 'twas the boy that stole your meat, and you'll beat the post" (Act II, scene i). Hunter long ago saw that the deception practiced upon Gloucester by Edgar had no parallel in Sidney. He considered that this feature of the sub-plot was an unhappy invention of Shakespeare's own.¹ Gloucester, desiring death as the only solution of his troubles, asks his guide to lead him to the edge of Dover cliff (suggested by the "high rock" of Sidney's tale). Gloucester—and here we have a notable departure from Sidney—is unaware that his guide is his son; for Edgar has assumed the rôle of a mad beggar, Tom of Bedlam. Edgar, instead of complying with his father's wishes or openingly refusing, as in Sidney, leads the blind man to an open field and urges him to jump. He does so and falls prone. Edgar then lifts up the old man, assumes a different voice, reveals his identity, and

¹ Hunter, *New Illustrations*, London, 1845, II, p. 273. Quoted by Furness, *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, King Lear*. Eleventh Edition, Philadelphia, n. d.

makes his father believe that the latter has actually taken the leap and that his life has been preserved by a miracle. As in the *Lazarillo* we have a blind man deceived by his leader into taking a leap wholly different from the one he proposes. Here the resemblance ends. In the one case the deceit is prompted by malice; the injury, even the death, of the blind man is sought. In the other the imposture is inspired by filial piety, and the aim is to bring the blind man out of his despair by means of a pious fraud. This episode may represent a union of Sidney's story with the "blind man's leap" story; but of course this is speculation difficult of proof. I merely offer this as a suggestion to Professor Wagner for use in the comparative study of the story which he has promised.

GEORGE T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Comedia Famosa de Las Burlas Veras de Ivlian de Armendariz.

Edited by S. I. MILLARD ROSENBERG, Philadelphia, 1917.

Pp. 206. Publications of the University of Pennsylvania.

Department of Romanic Languages and Literatures.

The ideal dissertation should open fields for farther investigation, and it is always a pleasure to see new fruits resulting from an old study. Mr. Rosenberg, after publishing as his dissertation *La Española de Florencia o Burlas y Amor Invenconero*, has given proof of continued zeal by making accessible two other equally important works whose similarity of title had led bibliographers into hopeless confusion. The second of these was *Las Burlas Veras* of Lope de Vega; the third, with which we are now concerned is a play of the same title by Julian de Armendariz. Its chief interest lies in the fact that it is the sole surviving play of one of Spain's minor dramatists, of whose work we had hitherto known little. The play itself is mediocre; it interests principally for its vivid scenes of student life.

In the first three chapters of his introduction, R. discusses the whole cycle of plays, repeating much that he had said in previous studies. The facsimiles in this volume had also been printed previously. One sees at once that R. still clings to his more than doubtful theory that Calderón wrote *La Española de Florencia*, in spite of A. L. Stiefel's arguments to the contrary. All will agree that the absence of a title in the Veragua list is no proof that Calderón did not write a given play. But in this case Calderón has expressly denied the authorship. A heavy burden of proof rests upon one who would father this foundling upon an author who denies its parentage, and R. offers nothing but subjective impressions, and similarities of style. Many after reading the play are equally confident that Calderón did not write it. The situation is the same as regards *La tía fingida*. Many scholars think they detect in this story undoubted traces of Cervantes' style; others are equally confident that the master never wrote a line of it. Now it may well be doubted if the authorship of any work can be determined on the basis of

style alone. *La Española de Florencia* is still of doubtful authorship. Stiefel, too, has not proved his case for Lope, though his argument is the more plausible of the two. The high authority of Morf, who sides with R., does not decide the question.

Chapter IV contains a brief biography of Armendariz, the best available. Other chapters discuss the play now edited. The weakest part of the study is the text itself, which has been edited with an absolute lack of critical method. On p. 167 the editor lists a number of words (*sigun, seguro, sigundo, quesiera, elusion, piadad*, etc.) which he terms "curious misspellings," thereby betraying a curious ignorance of Spanish dialects. He should have made a detailed study to solve the question whether these are Leonisms, such as a Salmantino like his author would have been likely to use, or whether they are dialect forms due to the scribe of the Parma MS here reproduced. In the poem, *El Patron Salmantino*, reprinted in the appendix, Armendariz writes pure Castilian. If R. had consistently substituted Castilian forms for dialect, such a method might be defended. Yet it seems safer to reproduce carefully the MS, correcting errors. This R. pretends to do: "The orthography of the MS has been scrupulously preserved, except that the punctuation has been modernized and that homonyms, interrogative pronouns, and the future and past definite tenses of verbs have been accented." (p. 61). But neither this system nor any other discoverable one has been consistently adhered to. Comparing text with the one page of facsimile, we find that *beras* is twice printed as *veras* (in the case of many other words with initial *b* the change has not been made) and *quesiera, quisiera*. One wonders how much more modernization there has been without indication in the footnotes. Dialect forms are often retained in the text, even when considered misspellings, and quite as often relegated to the footnotes. The clearly erroneous form *escribó* for *escribió* is retained, the very common *siguro* rejected. Sometimes the same form is treated differently at different times. Thus the MS reading *escuro* is retained (verse 1252) and changed to *oscuro* (verse 1426). A more complete lack of system is hardly to be conceived of.

The editor also makes mistakes of scansion. Verse 995 reads: *a que te siente[s] a su mesa*. The addition of the *s* destroys both sense and meter. The line: *o tortearé la cara* is not wrong. The verb is a coinage which should give no difficulty. Syneresis of *ea* is common in other verses. But how about R's proposed emendation: *o torturaré la cara*? Here there is one syllable too many. The following errors have also caught my attention: 499, read *hablado* for *hallado*, as the sense demands. Make the following two lines a question. 600, the phrase *Peor está que estaba* is a common expression. It is not necessary to suppose with R. that its use here implies the existence of a play by that title antedating this play and Calderón's well-known comedy, even though it does seem certain that Luis Alvarez wrote a like-titled play previous to the work of Calderón. See Schmidt (*Schauspiele Calderón's*, pp. 31 ff.). 659, the change of *lo* to *le* is unnecessary and wrong. 682, wrong: the MS reading is correct. 1163, *quel ruydo [a] ya pasado*, the

"*vocal embebida*" *a* should be placed after *ya*, not before it. 1255, *pues yo entro. Ve seguro*, change *re* to *vete*, as suggested in the note. The hiatus is unlikely. 1564-5, make these lines a question. 1802, *¡Santo, en gracia!* *¡Santa Ynes!* Nonsense. Read: *Santa Engracia*, etc. 1934, *obligado* is a misprint for *obligada*. 2106, emendation wrong. Retain the MS reading. 2226, note, *esbribió*, a misprint. 2299, retain *estella*. 2482, *dará dichoso fin*, etc. *Dará* is an emendation for *dire* of the MS. Read rather *diere*: the context demands a subjunctive. 2645 and 2652, retain the MS readings.

It would be unfair to convey the impression that R. has not made some good emendations. There is also much of value in the notes, even if these are often too elementary in character. Scholars, to whom alone the volume is addressed, do not need to be informed that *diabro-diablo*, *ynorancia-ignorancia*, *bergudo-verdugo*, etc. The literary portion of the present study is far superior to the linguistic.

GEORGE T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Les Œuvres de Guiot de Provins, poète lyrique et satirique. Editées par JOHN ORR. Pp. lv+206. Manchester: Imprimerie de l'Université, 1915.

This is an excellent edition of the complete works of a French poet of the time of Philippe Auguste, a poet who, after attempting a career as professional singer in the seigneurial courts, turned monk, first at Clairvaux and then at Cluny, and who, moreover, saw something of life in Palestine during the Third Crusade. The works consist of five chansons, the *Bible*, which falls into two distinct parts, and a short religious meditation formerly published as a *Suite* to the *Bible*, but now more accurately entitled *L'Armeure du Chevalier*.

One-fifth of Guiot's *Bible* (the word seems to be used in the sense of "epitome of wisdom") is a lengthy lamentation upon the decadence of the French nobility from such as the author knew it in his youth: an interesting list of 86 of his supposed benefactors is passed in review, patrons renowned for prowess and generosity, kings, dukes, and lesser notables, "the like of whom the world will never see again." Under Philippe Auguste, and largely as a result of the two crusades, the social order was evidently changing; the monarchy was growing rapidly at the expense of the provincial courts; centers of culture like those for which Crestien de Troyes had written had entered upon a decline, the prestige of the University at Paris meantime increasing the influence of the national capital. Guiot, discouraged by the prevailing "avarice" and the decadence of patronage, had no choice but to go into a monastery. Here, however, he was no better off, and the remaining four-fifths of the *Bible* is a lively satire on the regular clergy, with some attention at the end to the foibles of theologians, lawyers, and doctors.

The work of editing the *Bible* from two rather poor manuscripts has been done with care; Mr. Orr had the advantage of the advice of Professors

A. Thomas and A. Jeanroy, and the result is to be accepted as a definitive edition, unless other sources or materials (there are mentions of four manuscripts which have been lost) should come to light. A thorough study has been made of the language of Guiot, the variants are given with the greatest care, and there is no disposition to evade difficulties. Only a few suggestions can find place here. *Bible* 42: *aovrir* is well attested for both Crestien and Marie de France (*Espg.* 29, *Eliduc* 653, although wanting in Warnke's glossary to the *Fables*). 131: The change of *cui* to *cuit* is unnecessary, as there seem to have been two forms of the verb, *cui*er and *cuidier*, both, by the way, in the *Roland*. 687: The reading of the MS, rejected by Mr. Orr, seems to me unobjectionable: *Oil, j'oi dire qu'il i part*, "Yes, I hear it said that he [the Pope] shares in it [gets his share]." For *partir* in this sense, cf. *li rois devoit partir à son chatel* (*La Male Honte*, 8-9): here the king would take a part of the property upon the death of the owner. 2667: To the note on page 151 upon *mâchefer* might be added that Mosemiller (*ML Notes*, XX, 248) has almost certainly hit upon the correct explanation of this word: Franche-Comté dialectal *merde* (*de*) *fer* = SCORIA FERRI.

It is well known that San Marte edited the *Bible* upon the presupposition of the identity of Guiot with the famous Kyot of Wolfram's *Parzival*. Mr. Orr's labors throw no new light upon this problem, except perhaps in making clearer the fact that Guiot in his younger days studied in Provence and learned there the art of the *trobadors*. The editor states (note, p. xii): "Je n'essaye pas de résoudre le difficile problème des sources de Wolfram. Mais, les rapports de notre poète avec la Provence étant assurés, ne faudrait-il pas en tenir compte si, un jour, on s'avise à revenir sur cette identification?" The question, then, remains open.

Two other aspects of this publication seem quite noteworthy. While Guiot was of Provins, a town at no great distance from Paris, and wrote in a language which the editor would class as a pure French (following here, no doubt, the tradition of G. Paris, who always minimized somewhat the Champenois elements in Crestien), no effort has been made to furnish a "restored" or "normalized" text, such as we have in Foerster's editions of Crestien, especially the earlier ones. Most of the work of the Lorraine copyist has been allowed to stand, bizarre as it sometimes is and difficult to read. But this is surely wise, not only in this case but in others; the reaction against a rigorously consistent orthography is also to be favored.

If we mistake not, this edition, which inaugurates happily the "French Series" of the University of Manchester, is the first Old French text published in England having no immediate bearing upon English history. There have been some such texts published in the columns of the *Modern Language Quarterly* and the *Modern Language Review*, and perhaps elsewhere, but none, I believe, of this importance nor any edited with this degree of thoroughness or this wealth of illustrative commentary.

T. A. JENKINS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

